FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE

Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-89-188
Friday
29 September 1989

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-89-188 CONTENTS *29 September 1989*

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Grinevskiy Proposes 1990 Summit To Sign CFE Accord *[TASS]* ... 1
Galvin's 'Arms Redistribution' Plan Analyzed *[Bogachev on TASS]* ... 1
Talks Resume in Geneva With 'Good Prospects' *[TASS]* ... 2
Arms Talks Detailed, Significance Noted *[Moscow International]* ... 2
Canberra Chemical Weapons Forum Outcome Praised *[PRAVDA 24 Sep]* ... 3

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Perfilyev Conducts 28 Sep News Briefing ... 4
  Gorbachev To Visit GDR 6-7 Oct *[TASS]* ... 4
  Yazov To Visit U.S. 1-6 Oct *[TASS]* ... 4
  'Improvement' in Lebanese Situation *[TASS]* ... 4
  More on Foreign Ministry Briefing *[Moscow International]* ... 4
TASS Summarizes Briefing ... 5
NATO Head Woerner Interviewed by Journalists *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 26 Sep]* ... 5
Future Demilitarized, Peaceful Europe Viewed *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 19 Sep]* ... 7
Similarity of Bush, Shevardnadze UN Remarks Noted *[Vasiliyev on Moscow Radio Peace and Progress]* ... 8
IAEA Delegation Offers International Proposals *[TASS]* ... 9

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Shevardnadze, Canada's Clark Discuss Key Issues *[TASS]* ... 10
Canada Offers to Host Possible 'Open Sky' Talks *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 26 Sep]* ... 10
Political Observer Welcomes Bush's UN Speech *[Kobysh on Moscow TV]* ... 10
Commentary on Defense Secretary Cheney's Remarks *[Alekseyev on Moscow International]* ... 11
PRAVDA Cites Quayle at Tokyo News Conference *[27 Sep]* ... 11
U.S. Committee Reports on USSR-U.S. Relations *[TASS]* ... 11
Ford Consortium Pullout From Joint Venture Viewed *[IZVESTIYA 23 Sep]* ... 12

China

PRC Economic Reform Faces New Difficulties *[PRAVDA 23 Sep]* ... 14
Commentary on Improved CPSU-CPC Relations *[Alekseyev on Moscow International]* ... 15

Northeast Asia

Paper on U.S. Envoy's Criticism of JSP Platform *[IZVESTIYA 26 Sep]* ... 16
Japan-U.S. Joint Maneuvers Termed 'Threatening' *[Kalinin on Moscow International]* ... 16
Further on Japanese Statement on Kurile Islands *[Moscow International]* ... 17

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Vietnamese General on Pullout, Cambodia Prospects *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 23 Sep]* ... 18
Commentary on New Situation in Cambodia *[Shakov on Moscow International]* ... 19

Near East & South Asia

Shevardnadze Meets With Israeli Counterpart ... 19
  Urges Direct Talks With PLO *[TASS]* ... 19
  Talks With Arens Detailed *[TASS]* ... 19
  Queried on Dialogue With Israel *[TASS]* ... 19
'Danger' of U.S.-Israeli Military Accord Noted *[TASS]* ... 21
Shevardnadze Receives PLO's Faruq Qaddumi *[TASS]* ... 21
Shevardnadze, Wakil Discuss Afghan Situation *[TASS]* ... 21
Iran's 'Positive' Stance on Afghanistan Praised *[Moscow International]* ... 22
'Concern' Over Rafsanjani's 'Hostile' Remarks *[(Marozov) on Moscow International]* ... 22
Velayati on Need To Eliminate Chemical Weapons *[Moscow International]* ... 23
Commentary on Arrests, Situation in Sudan *[Borisov on Moscow International]* ... 23
Pallayev-Led Delegation Arrives in Morocco *[TASS]* ... 24

East Europe

Shevardnadze Meets Hungarian Foreign Minister *[TASS]* ... 24
Yakovlev Holds Talks With Bulgaria's Zhivkov *[TASS]* ... 24
Yazov Greets Bulgaria on Army Anniversary *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 23 Sep]* ... 25
Bulgaria's Dzhurov Comments on Army Cuts, Turkey *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 23 Sep]* ... 25
Bulgarian Leaders Thank USSR for Congratulations *[PRAVDA 24 Sep]* ... 27
PRAVDA Reports PZPR, CPCZ Leaders' Talks *[26 Sep]* ... 28
Nikolay Shishlin Views Reforms in E. Europe *[Paris LIBERATION 22 Sep]* ... 28

West Europe

Shevardnadze Meets Counterparts in New York ... 30
  Meets FRG's Genscher *[TASS]* ... 30
  Talks With Austria's Mock *[TASS]* ... 30
  Meets Sweden's Andersson *[TASS]* ... 30
  Speaks With Belgium's Eyskens *[TASS]* ... 30
  Meets Malta's Adami *[TASS]* ... 30
Kohl Remarks to CDU Congress Viewed, Criticized *[PRAVDA 23 Sep]* ... 31
CDU Warned Off Reviving 'German Question' *[Pavlov in PRAVDA 23 Sep]* ... 32
West Germany Accused of 'Propaganda Campaign' *[Moscow TV]* ... 33
CPSU, FRG Greens Hold 'Useful' Exchange *[PRAVDA 23 Sep]* ... 33
Italian President Receives Nishanov Delegation *[TASS]* ... 33

Latin America & Caribbean

Soviet-Cuban Relations, Shevardnadze Visit Viewed *[Moscow International]* ... 34

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Supreme Soviet Session

First Two Days of Supreme Soviet Session Viewed *[IZVESTIYA 28 Sep]* ... 35
Work Plan for Supreme Soviet Agreed to 25 Sep *[IZVESTIYA 26 Sep]* ... 36
PRAVDA Reports 26 Sep Proceedings *[27 Sep]* ... 36
Agenda Detailed, Cooperatives Law Discussed 26 Sep *[IZVESTIYA 27 Sep]* ... 38
  Debate on Cooperative System Detailed *[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 27 Sep]* ... 39
Supreme Soviet Committees, Commissions Meet 28 Sep ... 40
  Deputies Debate Draft Budget, Land Law *[TASS]* ... 41
  Republican, All-Union Ties Discussed *[Moscow Radio]* ... 42

Political & Social

Gorbachev Speaks at 28 Sep Ukrainian Plenum *[Moscow Radio]* ... 42

  - Gorbachev Interviewed *[Moscow Radio]* ... 51
  - Addresses Kiev Residents *[Moscow TV]* ... 52
  - Returns to Moscow *[TASS]* ... 53
- More on Gorbachev Remarks at Award Ceremony *[PRAVDA 28 Sep]* ... 53
- Commentary Explains Decision on Brezhnev Award *[Moscow Radio]* ... 55
- Estonia Said To Be Experiencing 'Cold War' *[SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA 8 Sep]* ... 55
- Estonian Deputies Protest CPSU Party Statement *[SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA 1 Sep]* ... 57
- New Latvian People's Front Program Outlined *[IZVESTIYA 28 Sep]* ... 59
- Latvian Anti-Army Rally Reported *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 26 Sep]* ... 59
- Vagris Discusses CPSU Party Baltics Statement *[TRUD 17 Sep]* ... 61
- Latvian Workers Union Position Outlined *[TRUD 12 Sep]* ... 63
- Lithuanian Supreme Soviet Resumes Session *[Vilnius International]* ... 65
- Vilnius 'Protest March' Marks Pact Anniversary *[Vilnius International]* ... 65
- Lithuanian Leader 'Hopeful' After Moscow *[SOVETSKAYA LITVA 17 Sep]* ... 66
- Baltic Newsmen Protest Media Disinformation *[SOVETSKAYA LITVA 7 Sep]* ... 67
- 'One-Sided' Debate in Lithuania Criticized *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 6 Sep]* ... 68
- Government Commission on Chernobyl Continues Work *[TASS]* ... 69
- Gumbaridze Discusses Georgian Draftees With Lizichev *[Tbilisi ZARYA VOSTOKA 15 Sep]* ... 70
- Soviet Leaders 'Misled' on Blockade's End *[Kasyan on Yerevan International]* ... 70
- Azerbaijan Panels on Interethnic Relations Meet *[BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY 2 Sep]* ... 71
- Kirghiz Supreme Soviet Discusses Law on Languages *[Moscow TV]* ... 72
- Gas Explosion Near Ordzhonikidze Reported *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 21 Sep]* ... 72
- State Gas Concern 'Gazprom' Created *[GAZOVAYA PROMYSHLENNOST No 9]* ... 72
- Aide Defends Yeltsin Conduct on U.S. Trip *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 27 Sep]* ... 74
- Jewish Immigrant Protests at U.S. Embassy Viewed *[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 13 Sep]* ... 77
- RSFSR Supreme Soviet To Convene 25 October *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 24 Sep]* ... 78
- Committee for RSFSR Trade Union Congress Set Up *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 26 Sep]* ... 78
- Tajik Supreme Soviet on Soviets' Role, Elections *[IZVESTIYA 25 Sep]* ... 78
- Volodin Addresses Orel Obkom Plenum *[PRAVDA 26 Sep]* ... 79
- Yaroslavl People's Front Created *[IZVESTIYA 26 Sep]* ... 79
- Anthology Chronicles Lenin's View on Nationalities *[PRAVDA 23 Sep]* ... 79
- More on Ideology Course Addressed by Officials *[PRAVDA 23 Sep]* ... 79
- Volga Germans Set Up Society in Ukraine *[IZVESTIYA 20 Sep]* ... 80
- Power Industry Faces Winter Difficulties *[PRAVDA 26 Sep]* ... 80
- Voronin Attends Machine Builders' Day Meeting *[PRAVDA 23 Sep]* ... 80
- Heavy Machine Building Minister Velichko Interviewed *[Moscow Radio]* ... 81
- Dushanbe Special Food Store Closed *[IZVESTIYA 23 Jun]* ... 81
- Official Interviewed on Crime Rate Data *[Moscow TV]* ... 81

Economic

- Ministers Criticized for Consumer Shortages *[PRAVDA 24 Sep]* ... 82
- Newsmen Given Declassified Data on Foreign Trade ... 83

Scientific

- Civilian Production Begins at Space Facility *[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 22 Sep]* ... 84
- Parameters of 'Intercosmos-24' Satellite Given *[TASS]* ... 85
  - Minimum distance - 511 kilometers, ... 85
  - Initial period of revolution - 116 minutes, ... 85
  - Inclination - 82.6 degrees. ... 85
- Joint Cancer Expedition Yields Results *[Moscow TV]* ... 86

Military

- Kuzmin Cited on Baltic Military District Issues *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 23 Sep]* ... 86
- General Shabanov Notes Projected Arms Cuts *[TASS]* ... 88
- Batkov Says Soviet 'Stealth' Not Planned *[TASS]* ... 89

Grinevskiy Proposes 1990 Summit To Sign CFE Accord

LD2809153189 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1334 GMT 28 Sep 89

[Text] Vienna, 28 Sep (TASS)—TASS correspondent Vladimir Smelov reports:

To step up the pace of the Vienna talks on conventional armed forces in Europe, and to clear the way for achieving a speedy accord there—these are the basic aims of the new proposals by the Warsaw Pact states on limiting frontline (tactical) combat aircraft and combat helicopters. The proposals were officially put forward on behalf of the Warsaw Pact by the GDR delegation at today's plenary meeting of the forum.

The new working document, said delegation leader Ambassador Klaus-Dieter Ernst, aims to help resolve one of the most substantial matters of contention and to remove a significant obstacle hindering the progress of the talks.

The socialist countries are now proposing to include in the talks all frontline (tactical) aircraft—bombers, fighter-bombers, ground-attack aircraft, frontline fighters, and also intelligence-gathering aircraft and electronic warfare aircraft—establishing for them a limit of 4,700 units for each of the alliances. Air-defense aircraft are not included in this level, since they do not possess the ability to inflict strikes on ground targets and are not part of the potential for sudden attack. These aircraft have characeristic external features, as well as weapons and equipment, which make it possible to distinguish them from combat aircraft.

In a conversation with a TASS correspondent, O.A. Grinevskiy, ambassador at large and head of the Soviet delegation, said in connection with this: We are ready to give Western specialists the opportunity to convince themselves of this. In particular by means of on-the-spot verification [kontrol] and with the relevant notification. At the same time, inspectors would be given the right of free access to aircraft, of inspecting them and their weapons systems. In the interests of compromise we could also agree to setting a certain level for such antimissile defense aircraft provided that the means against which these aircraft are intended to be used are not increased.

In order to complete the Vienna talks during 1990, which both the Warsaw Pact and NATO favor, the head of the Soviet delegation continued, a kind of strategy for their acceleration is necessary. We proposed to the United States and the NATO countries to hold a conference at the highest level in the second half of 1990 for the signing of an agreement on conventional armed forces, which the leaders of European states could attend. That would be an all-European conference of unprecedented scale. With the aim of preparing for it, it would be possible at the beginning of next year to hold a meeting of foreign affairs ministers in Vienna in order to resolve [razvyazka] the most complex problems at the talks, he added.

Galvin's 'Arms Redistribution' Plan Analyzed

LD2709183389 Moscow TASS in English 1815 GMT 27 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow September 27 TASS—By TASS military observer Vladimir Bogachev:

American General John Galvin, supreme commander of NATO's Armed Forces in Europe, has proposed "redistributing armaments" among NATO allies, which would allow them to preserve up-to-date weapon systems when the conventional arms treaty, now being worked out in Vienna, begins to be implemented.

This would considerably reduce the significance of the treaty.

The plan, advanced by Galvin at his headquarters in Mons, Belgium, proposes that NATO countries, which have many modern tanks, armoured personnel carriers, aircraft and artillery guns, transfer some of these weapons to other NATO allies having outdated weapons, before the conventional arms treaty enters into force.

So, according to the general, each NATO ally would fulfill its quota of cuts under the future treaty by eliminating outdated weapons.

Galvin said it would be unwise to destroy a new plane and preserve an outdated one.

The general is taking too much on himself and trying to put pressure on the Vienna talks, insisting that the future treaty should give each NATO country the right to decide itself whether to transfer its latest weapons to allies or destroy them.

The issue of the treaty's content will be decided at the negotiating table in Vienna, rather than at NATO headquarters.

There have already been precedents of banning the transfer of weapons, to be destroyed under a treaty, to other countries.

The incumbent NATO commander is an ardent advocate of measures that would nullify agreements reducing the level of military confrontation in Europe.

And his proposals on replacing intermediate- and shorter-range missiles, banned by the Soviet-U.S. treaty, with up-to-date American weapons, are well-known.

The Galvin plan of "redistributing armaments" in NATO countries pursues similar goals—to emasculate the future treaty on conventional forces in Europe and leave loopholes in it to circumvent the treaty's major provisions.

Talks Resume in Geneva With 'Good Prospects'

LD2809161189 Moscow Tass in English 1522 GMT 28 Sep 89

[Text] Geneva September 28 TASS—Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space weapons resume here on Friday following an agreement reached at a meeting in Jackson Hole, U.S., by Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and U.S. Secretary of State James Baker.

Soviet delegation head Yury Nazarkin told journalists here that key issues of nuclear and space weapons featured prominently in Mikhail Gorbachev's message to George Bush and at Shevardnadze's talks with Baker.

The sides said there were good prospects for signing the treaty on a 50 per cent cut in strategic nuclear weapons after new compromises were reached.

Arms Talks Detailed, Significance Noted

LD2809215789 Moscow International Service in Slovak 1600 GMT 28 Sep 89

[Unattributed commentary]

[Text] For several days the whole world's attention was focused on the usually quiet valley of Jackson Hole in the U.S. state of Wyoming, where a meeting took place between the leading representatives of the Soviet and U.S. foreign ministries. Our commentator has this to say about the results of the talks.

The significance of the Soviet-U.S. talks for the destiny of the world is difficult to overestimate, because from the military point of view these are the two most powerful states on this planet, and states which until quite recently were in a situation of stark confrontation which threatened to degenerate into a world catastrophe. People know that although relations between the two states have improved recently, the potential of destructive nuclear power they have accumulated has remained practically intact. The talks in Wyoming show that the Soviet Union and the United States are coming close to specific measures for the elimination of that potential.

On arrival in Wyoming, the Soviet minister, Eduard Shevardnadze, stated that the coming talks call for new thinking. It is no secret that although in some directions the talks are showing tangible progress, other directions need to be speeded up and, in some cases, they need to find a way out of stalemates. New approaches were, indeed, forthcoming. First and foremost, these relate to the problem of strategic offensive weapons and space. The stumbling block in this area for many years now has been the notorious Star Wars program, or SDI. It is this program which is preventing an agreement on a 50-percent cut in strategic nuclear weapons. At the same time, however, official Washington admits that the originally declared aim of the SDI, to create an impenetrable antimissile shield, cannot be realized; yet the United States feels it impossible to abandon this project at the international level, at least. The Soviet Union has made a realistic assessment of the situation, and has propsed a compromise approach. Moscow is willing to conclude an agreement on strategic arms cuts even if an agreement on space is not achieved. The vital conditions is that the ABM treaty signed in 1972 is observed. The link between these two agreements on strategic offensive weapons will be made by the fact that each side will have the right to withdraw from the agreement on strategic offensive weapons if the ABM treaty is found to be violated.

The Soviet Union and the United States are striving to overcome the difficulties arising out of the different structures of their strategic arsenals. Compromise proposals have been submitted in respect of sea- and air-based cruise missiles, and the United States had dropped its demand for a ban on mobile ICBMs. On the issue of a total chemical weapons ban, too, there is tangible progress. In Wyoming, the Soviet Union and the United States not only reaffirmed their commitment to this noble idea, but agreed to exchange data on their chemical warfare potentials prior to the signing of a convention, and then to carry out on-site inspections.

An important part of the talks was also given over to the issues of reducing conventional forces and equipment on the European continent. The Soviet Union has put forward a special strategy for speeding up the Vienna talks, because fast progress is needed if the aim formulated by President Bush of thrasing out an agreement in 6-12 months is to be achieved. As we know, the bone of contention between the two sides right now is what specific types of weapons should be included in the specific category of the most destabilizing types of weapon, for it is these weapons which must be cut first. The Soviet Union has proposed that ll combat aircraft should be included in the ambit of the Vienna negotiations, and that a ceiling of 4,700 of these should be set for each bloc. As far as air-defense interceptor planes, which are causing the sharpest arguments, are concerned, it is anticipated that individual ceilings will be set.

At the same time, the Soviet Union emphasizes that the European process need not be restricted solely to arms reductions. It is a matter of formulating a new system of relations which would be characterized by trust and cooperation. All the necessary information on the armed forces deployed from the Atlantic to the Urals should be used for the discussion, and all movements and concentrations of troops must be monitored. At the same time, this process is determined by the will of all the states on the continent.

It was probably no coincidence that one of the questions put to Comrade Shevardnadze at the press conference was this: What role is played in this process by the transformations currently under way in a number of East European countries? According to the Soviet Union, its allies in the Warsaw Pact proceed from a united viewpoint on issues of arms control and confidence-building measures in Europe. This common approach has been enhanced by the relevance and importance of the ideas expressed by the Soviet minister in Wyoming. An (?incidental) result of these meetings has been that we have begun to move on from mutual understanding between the two superpowers to mutual cooperation. This was also confirmed by the fact that a time was set for a meeting between the Soviet and U.S. leaders. This means that major agreements will be concluded, and considerable progress will be made on the path to universal security.

Canberra Chemical Weapons Forum Outcome Praised

PM2809134989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Sep 89 First Edition p 5

[Report by own correspondent V. Ivkin: "Canberra Forum"]

[Text] Canberra, 23 Sep—An international conference of representatives of governments and industrial circles against chemical weapons ended yesterday in the Australian capital. It took place in a constructive spirit, and there was clear evidence of the common intention of the participants from 68 countries to seek the earliest conclusion of the convention on banning and destroying chenmical armaments, which has been under discussion for nearly 20 years within the framework of the Geneva Conference on Disarmament.

At the final press conference Australian Minister of Foreign Affairs and Trade G. Evans noted that the conference had been successful and would undoubtedly be a major stimulus to the Geneva talks.

At the forum a fruitful dialogue was arranged for the first time between politicians and industrialists. For the first time the producers of chemical weapons in many countries signed a joint statement expressing their resolve to conclude a convention banning chemical weapons as soon as possible.

"Our delegation assesses the conference results positively," N. Kovalev, representing the USSR State Commission on Military-Industrial Affairs, told PRAVDA. "We support the idea of setting up national groups of experts, and we believe it would be more fruitful to set them up in various spheres."

"As for certain developing countries' fears that a future convention on banning chemical weapons might place obstacles in the way of the development of the national chemical industry, they can be eliminated in the process of the Geneva talks," the interviewee said.

Perfilyev Conducts 28 Sep News Briefing

Gorbachev To Visit GDR 6-7 Oct

LD2809134889 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1315 GMT 28 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow, 28 Sep (TASS)—Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, will visit the GDR 6-7 October, journalists were told today at a Moscow briefing. Vadim Perfilyev, first deputy chief of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs Information Directorate, said that at the invitation of the GDR leadership, Mikhail Gorbachev will take part in ceremonies devoted to the 40th anniversary of the republic's foundation, which is marked on 7 October.

The itinerary includes a meeting with Erich Honecker, general secretary of the SED [Socialist Unity Party of Germany] Central Committee and chairman of the GDR State Council, and other leaders of the GDR.

Yazov To Visit U.S. 1-6 Oct

LD2809143389 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1401 GMT 28 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow, 28 Sept (TASS)—USSR Defense Minister Army General Dmitriy Yazov will be in the United States on an official visit 1-6 October, said Vadim Perfilyev, first deputy chief of USSR Foreign Ministry Information Directorate, at a briefing here today. The Soviet minister is traveling to the United States at the invitation of U.S. Secretary of Defense Richard Cheney.

Meetings are envisaged between Dmitriy Yazov and representatives of the U.S. military-political leadership, in particular with the secretary of defense, chairman of the joint chiefs of staff, a visit to the Pentagon, and also to a number of military units. A speech by Yazov at the National Defense University is planned. The visit agenda contains a preliminary provision for his meeting with members of Congress.

The Soviet Union, Vadim Perfilyev noted, expects that the personal meeting of the two ministers will serve to develop and broaden military contacts and deepen mutual understanding and trust between the USSR and the United States.

'Improvement' in Lebanese Situation

LD2809142589 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1320 GMT 28 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow, 28 Sep (TASS)—"The first signs of improvement have appeared in the Lebanese situation," Vadim Perfilyev, first deputy chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry Information Directorate said. Addressing a briefing here today, he commented on the report of a cease-fire in Lebanon which was achieved thanks to the efforts of the Tripartite Committee of the league of Arab countries.

At the same time, Vadim Perfilyev added, the situation in this country remains tense. Any careless, and moreover provocative step, is capable of leading once again to an outburst. Such a situation demands particular restraint from the groupings and sides involved in the Lebanese situation. Also required are circumspection and a readiness to further the success of efforts by the tripartite committee and the dialogue between the Lebanese themselves.

The Soviet Union believes, the USSR Foreign Ministry representative stressed, that the meeting of Lebanese parliamentarians, which is intended to open on 30 September in Saudi Arabia, may be a prologue to the settlement of the crisis in Lebanon. The main thing is not to break off the dialogue, no matter how difficult it might be.

Moscow sincerely hopes for success at the forthcoming talks and will welcome every step toward revival in Lebanon, Vadim Perfilyev said.

More on Foreign Ministry Briefing

LD2809210889 Moscow World Service in English 1910 GMT 28 Sep 89

[Text] There has been a regular briefing at the Soviet Foreign Ministry.

A Foreign Ministry spokesman drew attention to the fact that several days after South Africa's new President F.W. de Klerk promised to start dismantling apartheid, Pretoria announced its intentions to execute an activist of the African National Congress. The execution of Mangena Boesman is scheduled for Friday. The Soviet Union, said the spokesman, believes the execution will further increase tension in South Africa and greatly complicate the efforts of the organizations and groups that are trying to create a favorable atmosphere for the start of talks on the abolition of apartheid. The Foreign Ministry spokesman said Moscow hoped that the South African authorities would heed the demands of the world public and cancel the unfair sentence.

The Soviet Foreign Ministry expressed satisfaction with the first signs of the improvement of the situation in Lebanon following the efforts of the Arab League, enjoying broad international support. However any abrupt or provocative step could again explode the peace in that country and that's why the plan of the Committee of Three should be carried out in full. First of all there should be a meeting of Lebanese MPs in Saudi Arabia, scheduled for Saturday. The Soviet Union believes that the meeting can become a prologue for a settlement in Lebanon. It is ready to promote the efforts of the Committee of Three and the dialogue between the Lebanese sides.

The Soviet Foreign Ministry denounced the shellings by Afghan rebels of residential areas of Kabul. A sad record was set last Wednesday, 18 out of 19 victims were women and children. The briefing quoted a representative of the United Nations Human Rights Committee Felix Ermacora as saying that such actions of the armed opposition have deprived it of practically all public support in Afghanistan. The Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman said that apparently the extremist wing of the Afghan opposition does not want such support because it's more interested in the opinion of the foreign forces that supply it with money and arms. The Moscow briefing drew attention to the loss of thrust in the so-called provisional government by a considerable part of the opposition and the realization of the necessity of the talks with the present Afghan Government. Such talks have been favored by the Alliance of the (?Eight) in Iran.

The Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman criticized the new publication of the United States Defense Department on Soviet military power. The book, he said, clearly contains elements of old, narrow military thinking. The book upholds the strategy of deterrence and describes the concept of a common European home as a maneuver designed to weaken ties within NATO.

TASS Summarizes Briefing

LD2809160689 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1459 GMT 28 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow, 28 Sep (TASS)—Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, will visit the GDR on 6-7 October, Vadim Perfilyev, first deputy chief of the Information Administration of the USSR Foreign Ministry told journalists today at a briefing. A meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev and Erich Honecker is envisaged on the visit's agenda.

Dmitriy Yazov, USSR defense minister, will be in the United States on an official visit from 1-6 October. Meetings with the U.S. defense secretary and with the chairman of the joint of chiefs of staff and a visit to the Pentagon are envisaged. The diplomat described the main characteristic of the 12th round of the Soviet- U.S. talks on nuclear and space weapons, which opened today in Geneva, as the fact that it will take place in the light of the accords reached at the meeting between Eduard Shevardnadze and James Baker in Wyoming. The main task at the talks is to turn the corner toward a treaty on a 50-percent reduction in strategic offensive weapons at the Soviet-U.S. summit in 1990.

Later, Vadim Perfilyev commented on regional problems, mentioning, in particular, the intentions of the South African authorities to execute African National Congress activitist Mangena Boesman tomorrow, he stated: In the USSR, they are joining in the protests against the intention of Pretoria to carry out the death sentence. The USSR Foreign Ministry representative expressed the hope that the South African authorities will listen to the demands of the international community.

The journalists were also informed that yesterday a delegation of the USSR Supreme Soviet flew out on a visit to Morocco and Algeria. It is headed by Gaibnazar Pallayev, chairman of the Tajik Supreme Soviet Presidium. Bilateral relations are on the agenda of the meetings.

NATO Head Woerner Interviewed by Journalists

PM2809155589 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 26 Sep 89 First Edition p 3

[Correspondent Captain M. Zheglov report: "NATO Secretary General M. Woerner: 'We All Want Changes'"]

[Text] "NATO disarmament—arms control"—this was the theme of a familiarization tour organized for a group of Soviet journalists by the FRG Government's press and information department. Over the course of 8 days we participated in discussions at the federal chancellor's department and the FRG Ministries of Defense and Foreign Affairs, visited the center of the Bundeswehr's "inner leadership," and also attended the 1st Army Corps' "Offenes Visier" [open visor] exercise, held within the framework of the "Autumn Forge-89" series of NATO maneuvers. On the eve of our departure from the FRG, NATO Secretary General M. Woerner received the Soviet journalists in the North Atlantic bloc's headquarters.

It is easy to find the Brussels suburb of Evere, where NATO's political headquarters is located. Even several kilometers away the road signs informed us how far it was to the NATO headquarters. And then before us there was a complex of low buildings connected by numerous passages and surrounded by parking lots and helicopter pads.

It proved far easier to cross the border between the Federal Republic and Belgium than to cross the threshold of the NATO headquarters. On entering the press center building, we had to pass through a special device which registers metal. Then a guard required us to open all bags and briefcases and rummaged through their contents. After that we were told that it was forbidden to use cameras or tape recorders and that these requirements applied not just to us but to all visitors.

But even at the center of the North Atlantic bloc's political leadership there are no rules without exceptions. And the NATO secretary general permitted us to record what he said and also, incidentally, to take several photographs as a keepsake.

The conversation began not with the questions we had prepared in advance but with a sensational DIE WELT article on the NATO proposals supposedly newly submitted at the Vienna talks. The essence of these proposals boiled down to the need to change the existing situation in Europe. And, in the final analysis, to the unilateral disbandment of the Warsaw Pact organization. Here is what M. Woerner said about this:

"People in Western capitals and within NATO are thinking a great deal about the prospects for developing East-West relations. I believe that we are all—both the West and the Soviet Union—seeking an opportunity to create a new political order in Europe and new security structures which will take equally into account the security of all states. The plan to which DIE WELT refers does not exist. As NATO secretary general, I would know about it. And I would also like to say that the aspect of the Warsaw Pact states in the future and the question of individual states' membership of that organization do not come within NATO's competence. This question is resolved by the Warsaw Pact states themselves."

After these explanations the conversation touched on urgent problems of international politics.

[Question] Could you formulate the tasks facing NATO under the present conditions and define the main areas of your activity?

[Woerner] In this connection I would name three areas. First, NATO is regarded by many people as a purely military alliance. This is still linked with the "cold war" times. Of course, we are still a defensive alliance, but under present conditions its political nature is increasingly coming to the fore. Second, I regard NATO as an instrument of change, as a means helping to create a new political order, particularly in questions of security. M.S. Gorbachev frequently speaks of the "all-European home," while we speak of a stable and just world order. That is, we all want changes. NATO is contributing to these changes and will support their implementation. We constantly confirm our readiness to cooperate with the Soviet Union in all spheres—economic, political, cultural. We are interested in seeing the successful process of reforms in the Soviet Union. This meets our interests. And we are ready to promote this process as far as we are able. Third, there is the defensive nature of NATO. We are following with great interest the start of the development of new thinking in the Soviet Union in the military sphere. I mean the change in the structure of the armed forces. We regard this seriously and hope some day to be convinced in practice of the results of the structural reorganization of the Soviet Armed Forces and the Warsaw Pact Armed Forces. This will, of course, affect the sense of threat. But I would like to say bluntly that we must still take our cue from the Warsaw Pact's potential and not from its intentions, which might change. We continue to take account of the potential, which is considerably in excess of ours. Therefore NATO will maintain its own defensive might to prevent war. But we hope that agreements on a fundamental change in the structure of military potentials at lower levels will be reached at the Vienna talks.

[Question] NATO is constantly talking of concern about the Soviet Union's superiority in the sphere of conventional arms. But the Soviet Union feels legitimate concern about NATO's superiority in the naval sphere.

[Woerner] There is no doubt that we respect the Soviet Union's legitimate interests, particularly in the security sphere. But it is necessary to see the fundamental geostrategic differences between NATO and the Warsaw Pact. The Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact states are a vast continent. But our allies—the United States and Canada—are separated from us by 6,000 km of marine expanses. So the naval forces or, more accurately, ships are for us the same thing as the railroads are for you. The naval forces are vitally essential to us, since they ensure the safety of our lines of communication. Therefore we are not interested in including naval forces in the mandate of any talks. In addition, you must take into account the fact that the naval forces are incapable of conducting offensive operations on the Soviet Union's territory. So the Soviet Union must not have any fears about the potential of our naval forces.

[Question] What can you say about the prospects for a discussion of military doctrines between the Warsaw Pact and NATO?

[Woerner] I view with great optimism the possibility of such a discussion within the framework of confidence-building measures. For us it is important that military doctrines and potentials be viewed together. We can talk a lot about military doctrines, but the means of realizing them still remain the chief thing.

[Question] What, in your view, are the prospects for the existence of nuclear weapons?

[Woerner] They will undoubtedly continue to exist. And there is one simple reason for this. Whatever political decisions are adopted, the knowledge, the technology, and the materials for producing these weapons will continue to exist. No one can guarantee that their production will not be resumed in the event of war. Therefore it is necessary to reach agreement on minimal levels of nuclear arms, in order thereby to ensure stability and their nonuse.

[Question] Are you thinking of installing a kind of hotline "red telephone" between the Warsaw Pact and NATO?

[Woerner] Of course, in some countries the opinion does exist that such a telephone needs to be installed, but in NATO as a whole this decision has not been agreed. However, such a possibility could be envisaged in the system of measures to strengthen confidence between the two blocs. [Woerner ends]

As you see, by replying to these and certain other of our questions, NATO Secretary General M. Woerner expounded the official viewpoint of the North Atlantic bloc's leadership. You can either agree with it, as, for example, in the positive assessment of the changes occurring in the international arena, or disagree with it, as, for example, in the assessment of the prospects for the existence of nuclear weapons and the need to include the naval component in the negotiating process. But the very possibility of learning it at first hand, as it were, substantially facilitates the search for points of contact between various states and military-political alliances.

Future Demilitarized, Peaceful Europe Viewed

18011002 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 19 Sep 89 First Edition p 3

[Article by Vladlen Kuznetsov: "A Warning for All Times"]

[Text] During the breakthrough phases of world development—and we are currently living through just such a phase—our thoughts turn more frequently to history than they do in average, so to say, ordinary times. They turn to history's experience, its lessons. They seek in history answers to the mind-boggling questions of modernity, support for decisions of principle.

The people of Europe, and not only of Europe, recently commemorated the 50th anniversary of the beginning of World War II. The tragic events and the lessons of the half-century's remoteness must not fade into oblivion, to blot out the memory of the generations. They are a warning for all times.

The wounds on the body of Europe have been healed for a long time now. But the scars remained, and they are as irremovable as is the memory of war itself, and its lessons, which should not be forgotten, even if almost a half-century of peace has reigned over its former ruins and ashes, the longest peace in the continent's history. It should not be forgotten because the complications, crises, and conflicts usually arise from the things to which we attach no particular importance at the moment, like a fire from a carelessly thrown match or cigarette butt, or an unextinguished campfire. Where there is military confrontation or contiguity of blocs, it is dangerous; any spark may prove fateful. As even Aristotle said, wars arise over trifles, but their reasons are never trivial.

In many ways, Europe's peaceful future is already ensured, by the recognition of the inviolability of borders and the existing status quo, by the incipient physical disarmament, the common-European process, and the general improvement of East West relations. Many politicians and commentators associate the further fate of these relations with the processes of renewal in the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. These changes, which require peaceful conditions for their realization, work toward stabilizing the situation in Europe, toward weakening military confrontation. Such is the objective content and intention of these transformations, and they are evaluated as such in those circles of the NATO countries which think realistically. Zbigniew Brzezinski, the venerable political scientist and former national security adviser to the U.S. President, has on more than one occasion in the past given cause for criticism of his biased approach to events in the socialist world. If I am not mistaken, he is now nearing the point of rising above his odious antipathies, declaring that the transformations in Eastern Europe have fundamentally important consequences for the stability of the relaxation of tensions between East and West. In the political scientist's opinion, in light of this, the NATO countries must "give a clear understanding that the West recognizes the necessity of Poland remaining in the Warsaw Pact."

However, not everyone is approaching such sober calculation. The temptation to play the Poland and Hungary cards is too great for those people for whom the world is "wedged" between the opposition of the "free world" and "godless communism," people who still think in categories of "rolling back" socialism. They are even trying to infect and attract official circles with their inept passion. On the pages of THE WASHINGTON POST, R. Evans and R. Novak claim to be rousing the administration out of "deep slumber." In the authors' opinion, it "does not have enough foresighted strategic thinking in order to exploit the crack in the Soviet empire." The dense back-seat drivers also found their way into THE NEW YORK TIMES, where they are dissatisfied with the White House's "surprisingly restrained reaction" at a moment when "there appeared a real opportunity for the weakening of communist influence in Europe." These gentlemen emancipate themselves from the need to think about what might occur, and what the end might be if the two sides take it upon themselves to weaken one another, to seek out cracks in the systems of their alliances, and to drives wedges into these cracks. As a result, would not stability, security, and peace in Europe, the basic interests of both sides, suffer?

I do not think that U.S. national interests on the continent would consist of conducting a course for the stratification of the Warsaw Pact structures, setting certain countries off against others, nudging toward "decommunization" and a "break with the USSR." Such an approach will not strengthen the U.S. position in Europe, for there can be no strong support, no reliable system of peace on unhealthy, torn-up soil. U.S. interests would be best served if they did not deviate on the whole from the interests of the majority of European states which crave stability, provision of good neighborly relations, and emancipation from the pressure of military expenditures.

What, in general, do American interests in Europe consist of? Of the dissolution of the Warsaw Pact? But after all, the members themselves aspire to this as an ultimate goal, if, of course, NATO reciprocates. Of bringing the socialist countries closer to the West, of assimilating its values? But after all, the socialist states are involved in this themselves, renouncing their former reticence and trying to enrich their value system with everything which seems worthy in the different life style.

The majority of peoples is convinced that the very greatest value, the highest interest is the opportunity to work and compete in peaceful conditions, to exchange accomplishments for the common good. However, in Washington, up to the present day, they have seen their interests not so much in international trade, which COCOM [Coordinating Committee for Multilateral Export Controls] has fettered in a mass of discriminatory stipulations, but rather in a high degree of political and military opposition on the continent. Today, a few people even call for an increase in that level.

True, in the White House recently there have been more frequent announcements of aspirations to "agree on a less militarized Europe," as President G. Bush himself put it. His proposals for reducing conventional forces and armaments in Europe appear to be more serious than, and preferable to previous American projects. However, there is still no basis for speaking of a radical revision by Washington of the scale and direction of its "military responsibilities" on the continent.

It is difficult to imagine a "less militarized Europe" without rejecting the doctrines of nuclear deterrence and "flexible response," geared toward "pre-emptive" use of nuclear weapons, without eliminating the European nuclear weapons remaining on the continent. Excluding its small tactical systems from the overall process of European disarmament, as the NATO leaders insist upon doing, would lead to a new take-off for the arms race in the nineties. To this day, the NATO countries still consider it possible to conduct maneuvers "during the course of which they theoretically destroyed a major part of Central Europe with the use of tactical nuclear weapons," as the American television company ABC reported.

A "less militarized Europe" is not compatible with the preservation of the Pentagon's military bases; with Washington's reluctance to discuss the problem of reducing the naval forces which play a noticeable role in the European strategic balance; with the various plans intended to compensate for the elimination of the medium-range nuclear systems covered by the Soviet-American treaty, themselves assessed as a "loss" by the NATO leadership.

Because of the opposition of many of the North Atlantic partners, Washington had to postpone the program for improving the nuclear systems remaining in Europe. However, now and then reports crop up in the western part of the continent that a "quiet" modernization is taking place. This testifies to the fact that Washington is determined to avoid a "third zero" at any cost, fearing both for the fate of the doctrine of nuclear deterrence and for the preservation of their obviously prolonged presence on the continent, which is no longer justified by any need. After all, across the ocean they fear that Western European society may demand that a "third zero" be followed by a "fourth," the withdrawal of the American "defenders," since the need for them declines as a result of the disappearance of the scarecrow of the "Soviet military threat."

Influential circles overseas still see American interests in Europe to be in the preservation of their emplacement and outpost in the Old World, as well as in the creation of such Western European military structures and organizations as would be under U.S. influence. These circles try to convince both themselves and others that U.S. interests are not served by active, multifaceted, and equal cooperation within the United States—Western Europe—Eastern Europe "triangle," but by a policy of differentiation, a "divide and conquer" policy with regard to the Warsaw Pact state, a policy of widely-advertised, but essentially meager "dosed" assistance which they are prepared to administer only to prevent the regular concession.

It seems that it would be much more useful to convince themselves of something entirely different. Of caution, of the need for a balanced approach, or delicacy, if you will. All the more so because the position of the White House does not always seem to be that way. We cannot but be alarmed that Washington today is not tactful in its relations, say, with Panama, Nicaragua, Cuba, or several other states. It seems that the White House must still show that it is not acting on a "what you see is better than what you get" basis, nor paving the road to the "common European home" with intrigues; that it is not giving in to the Soviets, nor to the temptation to put an early end to world socialism and the "Soviet empire." A superpower, imperial course is unsuited for Central America, Europe, or any other region. A sincere and honest policy based upon firm convictions and principles cannot be bifurcated. It cannot be duplicitous, with a false bottom, or a rock ready behind the back.

It must be seen and accounted for that the "decommunization" of Eastern Europe would lead to disintegration, and that would lead to destabilization. There is no state in Europe or beyond its borders whose interests would be served by a destabilized continent, one which had to pay for this with war a half-century ago. Those who emphasize the United States-USSR rivalry in Europe are taking a heavy responsibility upon themselves. Only Moscow and Washington's consolidated role, only their partnership is capable of rendering Europe the service it needs most: the organization of a structure of peace which would spare Europe conflict once and for all.

Similarity of Bush, Shevardnadze UN Remarks Noted

NC2809205889 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Persian to Iran 1530 GMT 28 Sep 89

[Igor Vasiliyev commentary]

[Excerpts] General political discussions continue at the UN General Assembly session in New York. Our commentator Igor Vasiliyev writes on this:

Without wanting to underestimate the role of other countries and nations in world development in any way, I have to express my personal view: That the two big powers have given a special glow to the current session. History has placed the heavy burden of responsibility vis-a-vis their own destiny and, to some extent, that of other countries on the shoulders of these powers.

The skyscraper in New York has seen many Soviet and U.S. representatives, including those of the highest level. Their speeches have sometimes been hostile, and they have even gone so far as to issue mutual threats. And if any success was scored in favor of peace, then both sides failed to take advantage of it.

But this time I think that the speeches by U.S. President George Bush and Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze were of a different kind. Both these officials were concerned with positive aspects and with a search for the solution of differences so that the society of nations might arrive at acceptable and mutual stances on disarmament and security at world and regional levels. And at this juncture, the emphatic objective of both powers of eliminating chemical weapons and bringing about a spectacular reduction of conventional, strategic, and other arms is obvious and striking.

As a journalist I could not ignore the specific similarity in the Bush and Shevardnadze formulas and in the common use of words such as openness, trust, and constructiveness. If this well-intentioned and hope-inspiring atmosphere that exists at the UN General Assembly is not accidentally clouded by unexpected happenings, then one can expect marked and effective results from the upcoming Gorbachev-Bush meeting. [Passage omitted]

Here I would like to point to the role of the social non-governmental organizations and, namely, to our radio station. As they say, it was providence that set us in search of ways to bring ordinary people closer together so that all of them can move toward a secure and coordinated world. The current situation helps toward this.

IAEA Delegation Offers International Proposals

LD2809224189 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1233 GMT 28 Sep 89

[Text] Vienna, 28 Sep (TASS)—Yuriy Novak, TASS correspondent, reports: There was a press conference by A.N. Protsenko, leader of the Soviet delegation, at the 33d session of the general conference of the International Atomic Energy Authority [IAEA] proceeding here in the Viennese "Austria" congress center.

In the Soviet Union the active and fruitful activity of the IAEA in strengthening the regime of the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons, the development of international cooperation in the field of the peaceful exploitation of atomic energy and the provision of the safe development of the nuclear energy industry is highly valued, it was noted at the press conference. One of the conditions necessary advancing along the path of nuclear disarmament is observance of the treaty on the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons, strengthening of it by all means possible, and the attachment of a universal nature to it. It is from these positions that one should approach the preparation and conduct of the fourth conference on the revision of the treaty in 1990. We call on countries which have not yet done this to join the treaty and to strictly observe its statutes concerning the fulfilment of obligations of placing their nuclear activity under the guarantees of the IAEA, and in this way make a contribution to the process of construction of a nuclear-free and nonviolent world, emphasized A.N. Protsenko.

Answering the questions of journalists on the prospects of the development of nuclear energy in the USSR, the Soviet spokesman remarked that in many countries, including the Soviet Union, the issue of the social acceptability of nuclear energy had become hotly disputed. This is connected with the accidents which have taken place at a number of Nuclear Electric Power Stations [AES] in several countries, including at Chernobyl. Despite the activization of the use of alternative power sources, including reusable ones, such as solar and wind power which can only be used in certain regions, we consider that the main source of electrical energy will continue to be atomic power. In the Soviet Union by 2005 the production of electricity at AES's will be doubled. At the present time its share of overall production of electrical energy makes up 13 percent.

The attention of the participants of the press conference was drawn to the Soviet Union's proposals to organize an international scientific research center at the site of the Chernobyl AES with the aim of jointly, with foreign specialists, studying a wide range of issues connected with the consequences of the accident at the AES and the elimination of their consequences. The second proposal concerns the organization of an international project on the territory of the USSR for research in the field of burying radioactive waste. These proposals met with a positive reaction both from the leadership of the IAEA in the speech of the Director General Hans Blix and among the member-states of the agency.

United States & Canada

Shevardnadze, Canada's Clark Discuss Key Issues

LD2809124789 Moscow TASS in English 1233 GMT 28 Sep 89

[Text] New York September 28 TASS—Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze met his Canadian counterpart Joseph Clark here to exchange opinions on Soviet-Canadian relations in light of the preparations for the upcoming Soviet visit of Canadian Prime Minister Brian Mulroney, to which both sides attach special importance.

The two ministers also discussed key issues of the visit and agreed on common stands concerning its political essence, documents and agreements.

The ministers expressed readiness to help the visit give further impetus to political dialogue and Soviet-Canadian contacts and cooperation.

The summit is also expected to find ways to promote Soviet- Canadian interaction in the international arena in the spirit of special responsibility, imposed on all members of internatonal community by the current crucial stage of the world's development.

At Clark's request, Shevardnadze told the minister about his impression of the Soviet-U.S. talks in Wyoming.

The two ministers discussed some other international issues as well.

Canada Offers to Host Possible 'Open Sky' Talks

PM2909090189 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 26 Sep 89 Second Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Canada: On the 'Open Sky' Talks"]

[Text] 25 Sep—Canada's Prime Minister Brian Mulroney has proposed that the talks between NATO and Warsaw Pact countries on the conclusion of an agreement within the framework of the "open sky" concept be held on Canadian territory.

The statement, issued in Ottawa by the office of Canada's head of government, notes that "the prime minister expressed satisfaction with the Soviet Union's positive response to the initiative by U.S. President George Bush to discuss a concept under which individual countries in the two military blocs will be allowed to carry out inspections of each other's territory on short notice, using unarmed aircraft for this purpose." "In the course of consultations," the document says, "we notified members of both blocs of our readiness to welcome participants in the 'open sky' talks in Canada." They will be sent official invitations. The time for holding the conference will be announced soon.

Political Observer Welcomes Bush's UN Speech

LD2909105989 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 28 Sep 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] The news media continue to discuss the U.S. President's speech at the UN General Assembly. Here is IZVESTIYA's political observer Vitaliy Kobysh:

[Kobysh] Good evening, comrade. The times are changing, and we are changing with them—as people said in the old days. There is much evidence of rapid changes in today's world, and here is one such piece of evidence.

On the opening day of the 44th UN General Assembly, U.S. President George Bush made a speech. By established tradition, all his predecessors had made similar speeches before him. Therefore, there was nothing unusual in the mere fact that he made the speech. The unusual element lay elsewhere. Unlike his predecessors, Bush had no messianic message. He did not make the world quake at the strength of U.S. arms, and he did not threaten anyone. Quite the reverse! He made it known that the United States sees peaceful cooperation with other peoples, the halting of the arms race, and the elimination of the threat of war as the path it must follow.

A few days previously, the White House chief held a meeting with Secretary of State James Baker and Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze, USSR minister of foreign affairs, at which among other things an accord was reached on a Soviet-U.S. summit.

I am very pleased with the progress we have achieved stated the U.S. President. We have, in principle, reached agreement on various matters, ranging from verification measures to nuclear arms tests. Each of these achievements is important in itself. But their importance is enhanced inasmuch as they are the signs of a new approach which dominates U.S.-Soviet relations.

These are good and responsible words. They are all the more weighty because George Bush backed them up by Washington's radical initiative in the sphere of chemical weapons. The U.S. President announced that the United States is ready without delay to start to eliminate chemical arsenals and to reduce them by more than 80 percent even before the convention completely eliminating chemical weapons is signed. This readiness had but one condition: The USSR should reduce its arsenals to an identical level. Those taking part in the General Assembly session were witnesses to how great diplomatic accomplishments are made possible on the basis of goodwill and mutual understanding.

Addressing the General Assembly on the following day, the USSR foreign minister on behalf of the Soviet Government not only agreed with the U.S. President's proposal, but also proposed to go further—to eliminate chemical weapons not by 80 percent, but completely. It looks like this idea was met with certain interest among the U.S. leaders. There are no grounds to become euphoric. Many of the most acute unresolved problems remain; conflicting issues remain, but things got off the ground in the right direction, as witnessed, in particular, by George Bush's speech at the UN General Assembly session.

Commentary on Defense Secretary Cheney's Remarks

LD2809174589 Moscow World Service in English 1510 GMT 28 Sep 89

[Text] The U.S. Defense Minister Richard Cheney has given a news conference at the Pentagon to present another Pentagon report: Soviet Military Power. The defense secretary said the U.S. welcomes the important changes in the home, foreign, and defense policies of the USSR. In his opinion, pluralism expanding in the Soviet Union promotes international stability. He announced that next week the Soviet Defense Minister, Dmitriy Yazov, will pay a visit to the United States and welcomed more contacts of that kind. At the same time the defence secretary supported a continued commitment by the USA and NATO to a strong military deterrent. He said that the military capability of the USSR continues to be a major threat to the West. Here is a commentary by Spartak Alekseyev.

The continued commitment to a strong military deterrent indicates that the Pentagon, although it has made some progress in the wake of the positive developments on the world scene recently, is still politically well behind them. It is high time new thinking was extended to the entire military sphere. This calls for further direct contacts between military [as heard] in order to enable them to remove the mutual fears about which the U.S. defense secretary spoke. The military of the two countries must work together to draw up new principles and concepts of world security. After all Moscow can also adopt the kind of stand the Pentagon has taken. It can also assert that the U.S. is the chief threat to the USSR. If these two statements of the issue are again placed at the foundation of world politics, we will all revert to the cold war and an unbridled arms race.

Luckily there have been signs that Washington and Moscow as well as their allies are beginning to move out of the impasse. Working together, they have come to realize that the clue to the future is in reducing all weapons in order to raise the security of one and all. The INF Treaty, having clipped 4 per cent of the American and Soviet nuclear arsenals, became 100 per cent proof that the arms race can be reversed. Last week at the Soviet-American talks in Washington in Wyoming, an agreement was reached to speed up the conclusion of a treaty on cutting strategic offensive weapons in half. Accord was reached on continuing the effort to reduce troops and conventional weapons in Europe and abolish chemical weapons. There is a clear trend towards an entirely new concept of security, relying above all on political means. As a journalist who has covered Soviet-American relations for a long time, I would very much like to hope for the best. I would like to hope that the Pentagon will not only welcome prospects for change in the policy and military strategy of the USSR but help such prospects to emerge by taking appropriate action mindful of President Roosevelt's warning about the necessity of creative attitude towards the future.

PRAVDA Cites Quayle at Tokyo News Conference

PM2909114989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Sep 89 Second Edition p 1

[TASS report: "Following 'Global Partnership' Course. D. Quayle Press Conference in Tokyo"]

[Text] Tokyo, 26 Sep—U.S. Vice President Dan Quayle assessed positively the results of the Soviet-U.S. talks which have ended in Wyoming.

Quayle expressed support for official Tokyo's claims to a part of Soviet territory. But he avoided answering a TASS correspondent's question as to whether this meant that the U.S. Administration does not deem it necessary to adhere to the 1945 Yalta Agreement which was signed by the United States, Britain, and the USSR, and which is, in particular, the basis of the Soviet Union's ownership of the islands disputed by the Japanese Government.

Quayle spoke in favor of further strengthening the alliance between Washington and Tokyo which, in his words, are linked by a "global partnership."

U.S. Committee Reports on USSR-U.S. Relations

LD2909021889 Moscow TASS in English 2300 GMT 28 Sep 89

[Text] Washington September 29 TASS—By TASS correspondent Vladimir Matyash:

The American committee on U.S.-Soviet relations believes that the development of relations with the Soviet Union on the basis of common sense and business cooperation is in the vital interests of the United States and its national security.

This is the upshot of the committee's report circulated here after its annual gathering on Wednesday [27 September] in the U.S. capital.

The committee, which unites more than 500 representatives of influential political, public and business quarters of the United States, has been making useful contributions to the development of the two nations' bilateral relations since the end of World War II.

The report states: The American committee on U.S.-Soviet relations fully supports initiatives to control and reduce nuclear arms, to lessen military competition, and to resolve political and military disputes by peaceful means.

At the same time the authors of the statement stressed that the relations between the Soviet Union and the United States should aim at reaching agreements to limit and reduce nuclear weapons to the lowest possible levels and to strengthen international means to avert thermonuclear war or the use of nuclear weapons by terrorists.

On the whole, the committee stated, its members were aiming at reducing tensions between East and West.

The report is yet another testimony to the high-priority significance attached by the realistically-minded politicians and public figures in the United States to the consolidation of the positive shifts in Soviet-U.S. relations in recent years largely due to regular U.S.-Soviet summit meetings.

Gorbachev's vigorous policies on the world scene facilitate the normalization of the world climate and the development of more stable relations between the United States and the Soviet union, the committee's chairman William Miller told TASS.

In this connection, he expressed hope for an expeditious attainment of an agreement on the fifty per cent cut in strategic nuclear weapons and new constructive steps aimed at limiting arsenals of nuclear and conventional arms.

"The common objective of the United States and the Soviet Union consists in arranging more stable and constructive relations, in which beneficial interaction on the world arena will gradually replace mistrust and rivalry," David Kendall told TASS.

The committee was addressed by Soviet Ambassador to the United States Yuriy Dubinin and U.S. Ambassador to the Soviet Union Jack Matlock. They advocated the continued and deepened political dialogue between the United States and the Soviet Union, and noted the importance of the forthcoming U.S.-Soviet summit.

Ford Consortium Pullout From Joint Venture Viewed

PM2809133789 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 23 Sep 89 Morning Edition p 6

[Dispatch by own correspondent A. Shalnev: "Why They Deprived Us of the Scorpios"]

[Text] New York—"If I were in Ford's place," I was told by one U.S. expert, "I would not have gotten into this business."

In fact that was just what Ford did: A few days before the agreement had to be signed it announced that it would not take part in it. The U.S. trade consortium formed in the spring of 1988 to create in conjunction with an analogous Soviet association joint ventures in those sectors for whose output we in the USSR have a special need—that consortium has lost an influential and wealthy partner.

We have lost a lot, although Ford itself refused to give me an accurate or even approximate figure, the corporation, according to existing assessments which there are no grounds for considering to be exaggerated, intended to invest something in the order of $3-4 billion in the Soviet economy. It was planned that the money would be used to set up in Gorkiy the production of approximately 100,000 1990 model Scorpio trucks. It was also planned that within the framework of the same deal Ford would initially supply us with passenger automobiles from its West European plants.

Now we must talk of all this not in the future tense, alas, but in the past. It is true that Ford does not deny its abiding interest in reaching the Soviet market but, I was told at the corporation, "we will not be ready soon to reach specific agreements with Soviet partners."

The U.S. trade consortium, created through the mediation efforts of James Giffen from the New York merchant bank Merkator [name as transliterated], has not disintegrated because of Ford's withdrawal. The agreement with the Soviet side has been signed and now Kodak, Chevron, Nabisco, Johnson and Johnson, and Archer-Daniels-Midland are engaged in talks which it is planned will lead to the conclusion of contracts for the creation in the Soviet Union of approximately 25 joint ventures in which up to $10 billion will be invested over the next 15 years. The food industry, the tobacco industry, the production of medical equipment, and the petrochemical industry will be covered by these contracts which, according to Giffen's figures, should be concluded before the end of this year.

Some economic observers consider this forecast to be excessively optimistic. FORTUNE Magazine recalls that "nothing is done quickly in the Soviet Union." We must not forget, I was told by Jonathan Halperin, leader of the Washington consultancy and research firm Information Resources, "that the members of the consortium will have to deal with a total of 30 different ministries and departments." A task of colossal complexity, although it is facilitated substantially by the fact that the Soviet Union has created its own foreign economic consortium for these deals which, FORTUNE notes, has gathered together "all high-ranking bureaucrats necessary to form joint ventures."

It must also be borne in mind that the contract concluded by one corporation will depend in one way or another on the contracts of all other corporations belonging to the consortium. And the main area of dependence is the currency one. The situation is simple: The consortium can extract billions and tens of billions of rubles from the enterprises it is to create, but to obtain a profit in hard currency and transfer the currency across the ocean or elsewhere and spend it on deliveries of raw material from abroad for these enterprises, the currency has first to be earned. According to available information, the consortium's entire activity is built on one company earning hard currency and then sharing it with others. By agreement, naturally.

This company, Chevron, is a petrochemical one. It will extract Soviet petroleum and export it abroad. Where from? Edward Scott, Chevron's vice president, says "we would like to obtain a deposit which has already been opened up in order to bring the oil on stream as soon as possible, within 5-6 years."

But at the headquarters of Giffen's corporation, Merkator, I was assured that the consortium's currency welfare does not depend on oil alone, that there are other opportunities and means. Which ones? I wondered. They refused to say, citing a confidential agreement reached with the Soviet side.

But these unnamed opportunities and means were evidently not sufficient to persuade Ford of the expediency of joining an agreement which may in a certain sense become the "agreement of the century." Why are the other corporations satisfied? I do not know the exact answer, but I suppose that in contrast to Ford, these corporations are not initially investing large capital in the planned joint ventures; therefore, it is easier for them than it is for Ford to wait for the time when there will be a currency profit. For instance, take the Archer-Daniels-Midland corporation: According to the U.S. press the bulk of the $100 million which will be invested in the creation of a joint venture to process wheat into fructose and gluten will come from a loan from a Soviet bank. ADM itself will invest something in the order of just $20 million. These are expenses on a scale which can be written off with no particular pain in the event of failure. But Ford, as noted in the statement with which the corporation announced its withdrawal from the consortium, proposed "a substantial initial contribution to the creation of a new truck complex in the Soviet Union."

It would be the simplest thing in the world to express dissatisfaction with Ford. It would be more important to understand it since—however sad it may be—Ford is far more typical in its attitude toward setting up economic ties with the Soviet Union than the other members of the consortium. Typical of U.S. business.

There is no denying that many U.S. businessmen have an unusual interest in reaching the Soviet market. But interest is combined with extraordinary caution. Right now just 40 U.S. companies—just 40 in the entire United States—have agreed to invest in the USSR's economy. Including five companies which are members of the consortium. But what about the hundreds and thousands of others? They were waiting. The majority are waiting for the ruble to become a convertible currency. In the meantime, as one U.S. businessman complained to NEWSWEEK, "the Soviets are trying to do business without money."

Others—and there are also many of them—are worried that they cannot understand who they have to deal with now in the Soviet Union when concluding contracts, agreements, and so forth. Previously everything was relatively clear: There was one gigantic foreign trade ministry with which talks might continue for years but whose enormous size and solidity were for businessmen something like an additional guarantee that the agreements and contracts would be fulfilled. But now there are thousands of enterprises, organizations, and institutions receiving access to the world market. While welcoming perestroyka, Americans are far from always ready to restructure themselves, to adapt to the changes taking place in our country. On the one hand they see great prospects connected with the present decentralizing processes in our foreign economic activity, on the other they are not prepared to make active use of the principles of the free market in dealing with the Soviet Union, are not prepared to take a risk which they might take in Spain, for instance.

Before concluding a deal with an unknown partner in Spain, an American or indeed any other foreign businessman tries to find out in more detail who he is dealing with and what this man has to his name and in the bank. It is a good thing that this information is accessible, albeit expensive. But how is that same American to find out who he is being asked to conclude a contract with in the Soviet Union, how is he to find out what kind of people stand behind a firm with a fine name which has just been formed?

It is partly for that reason, Jonathan Halperin says, that the Americans, in conducting talks in the Soviet Union, are seeking to insist on conditions and guarantees which they would never demand in another country. It is entirely possible that heightened demands which would be excessive under the normal conditions of the capitalist market were also made by Ford. Having failed to receive suitable guarantees which the corporation might not have asked for in other countries, it decided to leave the game.

And one more package of uncertainties. To call things by their name, it means the political uncertainties. They divide into two interconnected categories. The first category: uncertainty which is felt in U.S. business circles with regard to how stable perestroyka is and how long-term. An uncertainty which, it must be admitted, we ourselves are causing.

The June events in China had a cooling effect on businessmen. If, I heard in a number of talks, such a drastic deviation from the process of democratization proved possible in China, where is the guarantee that there will be no deviation from democratization and perestroyka in the Soviet Union? And if there is such a deviation, will the result not be what it was formerly, when a cold trade and economic war would flare up following the aggravation of relations between Moscow and Washington?

And here there is the second category of uncertainties: What is the position of the federal administration, businessmen are asking, how does it plan to do business with the Soviet Union, has it, finally, formulated its own Soviet policy or is this policy still at the development stage? Through its top figures, including the president, the administration is saying "yes" to perestroyka but emphatically refraining from any specific steps—and even words—which might promote perestroyka.

These sentiments are caught and copied by businessmen. In addition business circles cannot fail to take into account statements like the one made recently by David Wigg, deputy assistant secretary of defense for political analysis, a statement which spoke directly of the expediency of introducing a "selective trade embargo" against the "Soviet bloc countries," including, understandably, the Soviet Union. "The decline in trade between East and West," the Pentagon man said, "will seriously undermine Soviet economic growth and the process of industrial modernization and will step up pressure on Moscow," which will have either to satisfy "the West's worries in the security field (in other words make concessions to the West—A.Sh.) or jeopardize its global interests."

To be fair it must be noted that the call for an embargo was disavowed by a State Department staffer, but it is curious that in contrast to David Wigg this staffer asks for his name not to be mentioned. The result is a semiofficial or even unofficial repudiation.

What might a businessman think when he is acquainted with the proposal of a high-ranking official in the administration to introduce an embargo against a country with which he, the businessman, was on the point of considering establishing working relations. It seems to me personally that this is one more of the factors which compelled Ford to renounce participation in the consortium and to leave us without "Scorpios." And they would have been very useful to us....

China

PRC Economic Reform Faces New Difficulties

PM2909085589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Sep 89 Second Edition p 4

[PRAVDA special correspondent V. Ovchinnikov "Letter From China": "Difficult Ascent"; first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Excerpt] Beijing, Moscow—October 1 will be the 40th anniversary of the proclamation of the PRC. It is gratifying that this jubilee year should be marked by the normalization of Soviet-Chinese relations and the May meeting between the two countries' leaders in Beijing. With the restoration of interparty ties between the CPSU and the CPC, creative contacts have also been resumed between the newspapers PRAVDA and RENMIN RIBAO. It was decided to start our practical cooperation by exchanging special correspondents for a 2-week period. PRAVDA correspondent Vsevolod Ovchinnikov made such a visit to China on the eve of the PRC's 40th anniversary; the program for his visit was prepared by Chinese colleagues. Today we publish the first of his articles:

The day before I left Beijing, I visited the illuminated park of Beihai where, according to popular tradition, people were celebrating the middle of autumn. I was pleased to see smiling faces in Beijing. The imprint left by tank tracks on the asphalt of Changanjie Avenue is not the only reminder of the recent tragic events in the capital. Society has experienced a serious trauma which has left invisible scars in people's hearts.

The faces of people in the streets have become sterner and more withdrawn. Martial law is still in place. Everyone must carry their identity cards when they leave their home. It has been announced that people are going to be reregistered and their identity cards replaced right across the country. The number of foreign tourists has fallen sharply. Many hotel rooms are empty at the height of the season. Rows of taxis wait for passengers.

The academic year in higher education establishments has begun with political studies. Students are being read lectures analyzing the turbulent events of this spring on the basis of party documents. Similar political studies are being conducted at enterprises and various establishments.

At crossroads your eye is caught by brightly colored umbrellas, the kind you would find on a beach. Beneath them stand helmeted servicemen with assault rifles. In the evenings they patrol the streets in pairs. You are allowed to cross Tiananmen Square in a motor vehicle or on a bicycle, but you still are not allowed to cross it on foot. There will be no parades and demonstrations there to mark the anniversary of the proclamation of the PRC. Festive gatherings will be held in the capital's parks.

So the fast-approaching celebration—the 40th anniversary of the republic—will be marked by the country in an unusual situation. But, as always, it will be a reason to look back on past successes with pride and give serious thought to the reasons for errors and failures. The path traveled by the Chinese people over the past 4 decades has been both glorious and thorny. The years of restoration and the first 5-Year Plan laid the foundations of socialist transformations in the country. But this was followed by the extremes of the "Great Leap Forward," the leveling represented by the people's communes, and the pogroms of the "Cultural Revolution"—almost 20 years wasted. And, finally, the fourth decade, which, like the first, has left its healthy mark on the history of China. It was marked by a policy of reforms and openness, where the Communist Party was able to break with pseudorevolutionary phrasemongering and concentrate the people's energy on the socialist modernization of the country. The policy of reforms has brought impressive triumphs, particularly in rural areas. But in the last few years the implementation of these reforms has come up against more and more new difficulties.

"Like the Soviet Union, China must be a laboratory of reforms and follow an unexplored path by trial and error," Xu Kui, director of the Social Sciences Academy USSR and Eastern Europe Institute, said to me. "Reading the CPSU Central Committee statement on the situation in the Baltic and listening to Comrade Gorbachev's speech on Soviet television, I thought about how similar the problems facing our countries in the process of socialism's revolutionary renewal are. There is a tendency to try to resolve highly complex tasks at a stroke and to gamble on quick success, as was the case here during the years of the 'Great Leap Forward.' There are also deliberate attempts to discredit the reforms from an antisocialist standpoint with the aim of using the wave of change to turn the country in the direction of capitalism and completely transform it along Western lines. It goes without saying that we need foreign experience and the spiritual wealth accumulated by mankind. But we cannot ignore the difference between socialist and bourgeois values. Carried away with modernizing the economy, we have sometimes forgotten about cultivating our ideals.

"It seems to me," Professor Xu Kui continued, "that many Soviet people idealize the economic reforms in China. China has transferred the peasants to a family contract system, they say, and given enterprises their independence—and all its problems have been solved at one go. In reality, however, the situation is far more complicated. But, on the other hand, many people in China idealize the political reforms in the Soviet Union in the same way. The immediate desire to borrow positive experience is natural. But something else is no less important: to learn from one another's mistakes. We here in China must first of all get to the roots of this apparent paradox. The successes of the reforms are obvious and indisputable. People's lives have now been vastly improved, both in rural areas and in the cities. So why have feelings of dissatisfaction and even discontent begun to build up in people?"

"If the Chinese leadership had paid proper attention to this at the time, the social tension which was subsequently the backdrop to the disturbances would not have arisen in the country," said the institute director's assistant, Li Jingjie. "It is hard to blame someone for wanting quick successes. It is easy to raise people's expectations by them. But it is far harder to satisfy these expectations. And this gives rise to disappointment."

In the opinion of Li Jingjie, the social tension was caused by a whole series of factors, subjective and objective. First, errors were made in identifying the optimum combination of centralization and decentralization, the planned economy and the market economy. The old system was scrapped before the new one was put in place. In these conditions, rapid economic growth gave rise to unhealthy disproportions in the national economy and led to rising prices.

Second, the encouragement of personal initiative and enterprise has undoubtedly helped to lead the economy out of stagnation. But there is also a negative side to this. It very often happens that determined, unscrupulous people get rich quicker than decent, honest people. There are quite a number of people with a shady past among the nouveaux riches of the reform era. Desperate, boldly risking their own dirty money, they often defeat their competitors. People's dissatisfaction is also aroused by flaws in the taxation system in the cooperative and private sectors on one hand, and on the other hand, by vestiges of leveling in the state sector—particularly the underestimation of qualifications, experience, and talent. The renowned surgeon performing a trepanation of the skull in a state hospital earns less than the private hairdresser invited to shave the patient before his operation.

However, the form of social injustice most hated by the public is corruption among leading cadres. The transition to a mixed economy has played a positive role. But, on the other hand, with state enterprises rubbing shoulders with cooperatives and private businesses and the coexistence of centrally set prices, contractual prices, and market prices, fertile ground is created for bribetaking, speculation, and embezzlement. Consequently, demands to stop corruption have met with a sympathetic response from the population. [passage omitted]

Commentary on Improved CPSU-CPC Relations

OW2909003789 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 0100 GMT 28 Sep 89

[Alekseyev commentary; from the "World Today" program]

[Text] Gorbachev's visit to China in May ushered in a new phase in the development of relations between the two parties, as well as the two countries, said Jiang Zemin, general secretary of the CPC Central Committee, at a news conference in Beijing. He believed prospects for cooperation would be brighter between our two parties and countries on the basis of the five principles of peaceful coexistence.

Our station commentator Alekseyev writes: CPC leader Jiang Zemin said that cooperation between the CPC and CPSU is a domain in itself for Sino-Soviet cooperation. This is by no means accidental. Contact between the two parties is the most important part of Sino-Soviet relations in the new phase. The Soviet leader's visit to China represents a new turn to the relationship. The visit made it possible for the two countries to completely normalize their relations. Representatives of the two parties met in Moscow not long ago to discuss specifics of cooperation between the two parties.

Jiang Zemin believed that prospects for cooperation were bright. This optimism is based on several grounds. The first is the restored contact between the CPSU and CPC. The five principles of peaceful coexistence mentioned by the CPC leader, which include mutual respect for each other's independence and noninterference in each other's internal affairs, are applicable to the relationship between all parties. This is also an important principle. It is not [word indistinct] for anyone. The relationship between the CPSU and CPC in the fifties was based on complete unanimity in views. This practice led to conflicts with reality. Only relations between the two parties based on unconditional recognition of each other's total independence are truly solid relations. Such relations will not bring harm to [word indistinct]. What caused damage, huge damage at that, was the past policy which turned differences in views into ideological contention. The relationship between the CPC and CPSU during that period was just like that. The break-off in contact between the parties led to a split in all aspects of Sino-Soviet relations. Thanks to the reasonable, responsible attitude, and firm determination displayed by both sides to overcome the obstacles left over from the past, we are where we are today. Such a great breakthrough and good progress in Sino-Soviet relations conform to the wishes of the people of the two countries. Such a favorable turn on the eve of China's 40th National Day is particularly heartening. I would like to avail myself of this opportunity to wish happiness to all listeners of this station.

Northeast Asia

Paper on U.S. Envoy's Criticism of JSP Platform

PM2909083589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 26 Sep 89 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent S. Agafonov dispatch: "Demarche Assessed Unequivocally"]

[Text] Tokyo—A small but unusually significant report appeared in Japan's newspapers regarding a meeting between Michael Armacost, U.S. ambassador to Japan, and Eiichi Nagasue, chairman of the Democratic Socialist Party [DSP] Central Executive Committee. However, what is interesting is not the actual fact that the meeting took place but that a number of the well-honed phrases heard from the lips of the U.S. diplomat.

The section of Armacost's remarks intended for the press concerns the platform published recently by Japan's leading opposition force—the Japan Socialist Party [JSP]—in particular, the JSP's approach to questions of security and military partnership with the United States. Let us recall that in the platform published with an eye to the impending Japanese parliamentary elections—whose outcome looks extremely hopeful for the Socialists—the JSP has considerably softened its former assessment of the Japanese-U.S. "security agreement," and put forward a compromise formula dictated by its desire to create conditions for the formation of a multiparty coalition if it wins the elections. The U.S. side has so far refrained from commenting on this subject but assessments have now been voiced.

According to the U.S. ambassador's comments, the result of the JSP's proclaimed course on security questions may be to weaken and undermine Western unity and damage the disarmament talks under way with the Soviet Union. The shift of stress from bilateral military cooperation to the deepening of economic cooperation noted in the JSP program was the main reason for such serious conclusions. In addition, Armacost's objections were also provoked by the Socialists' intention, if they come to power, to tighten up supervision over the observance of the "three nonnuclear principles"—not to have, produce, or import nuclear weapons onto Japan's territory—since, according to the ambassador, the current mechanism based on the well-known principle of "not confirming and not denying the presence of nuclear weapons on board U.S. warships and aircraft" already operates without a hitch.

In short, Armacost's criticism of the JSP platform was expressed with the utmost diplomatic frankness. The following question arises: What is the reason for this and how is the fact that U.S. negativism made itself felt at a meeting with the leader of the DSP—the third opposition force in parliament in terms of representation—to be interpreted? Let us be blunt and say that this is an easy question, it presupposes one logical answer—in Japan's current complex domestic political situation Washington is unequivocally indicating that serious difficulties lie in store for Japanese-U.S. relations if the opposition forces headed by the JSP come to power. Moreover, formulas like a "threat to the Western alliance," which the U.S. ambassador obviously did not use by accident, illustrate that Americans do not want such a turn of events and will make every effort to prevent a political changeover in Tokyo.

How? That is the second half of the answer to the question—regarding the DSP's role in this specific diplomatic matter. The DSP is well known for its conservative tilt and its closeness on most domestic and foreign policy problems to the ruling Liberal Democratic Party [LDP]. A LDP-DSP coalition has long been regarded by observers here as the most likely way out of the current crisis among the political elite, moreover a painless solution at that. From that viewpoint, Armacost's frankness during his conversation with the DSP leader requires no particular comment: U.S. sympathies will indisputably play a special role and will be uppermost in the party leadership's thoughts on whom to align itself with—the JSP or the LDP.

It remains to say that the U.S. ambassador's demarche received a unanimous assessment in the Japanese mass media.

Japan-U.S. Joint Maneuvers Termed 'Threatening'

OW2909031389 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1200 GMT 27 Sep 89

[By commentator Kalinin]

[Text] Large-scale Japan-U.S. joint military maneuvers will start on 29 September. We will new broadcast Radio Moscow commentator Kalinin's comments.

The present Japan-U.S. joint maneuvers, from all indications, will be the largest in scale in the history of the two countries' military alliance. The exercises will last for 1 month and will be conducted in all sea areas of the Northwest Pacific. Two aircraft carrier fleets, around 100 Self-Defense Force [SDF] battleships, including two capital ships, around 60 U.S. warships, and 430 military planes will take part in the maneuvers.

It is noteworthy that these exercises will be held in conjunction with a series of other exercises. In particular, the 3th Division of the U.S. Marine Corps [USMC] Okinawa will be deployed in Hokkaido in October, and subsequently the 25th Division of the USMC will come from Hawaii for the specific purpose of conducting joint operations with the Japanese Ground SDF. The Ground SDF and the U.S. Army's support headquarters will also hold exercises simultaneously. We must also point out here that this series of joint military exercises is being planned at a time when the most massive maneuvers conducted by the United States and its allies in the Asia and Pacific Region, PACEX-89, are being held.

A Japanese Defense Agency spokesman denied the connection between PACEX-89 and the present maneuvers. He did not say a single a word about the SDF's participation in PACEX-89. However, we believe that such an assertion is untrue. To cite an example, the exercises being conducted in Europe and the Atlantic by NATO forces at present combine a series of various maneuvers by its ground, naval, and air forces in a master plan and all actions lead to one goal. Thus, from circumstantial evidence we can conclude that the present Japan-U.S.joint maneuvers have been planned as part of PACEX-89. The fact that the two sets of maneuvers are being conducted at the same time and in the same area, and that the aircraft carriers "Enterprise" and "Carl Vinson", other capital ships, and men and equipment which are taking part in PACEX-89 are also participating in joint the Japan-U.S. maneuvers prove our point.

Another notable point is that the PACEX-89 military exercises hypothesize a confrontation with the Soviet Pacific Fleet, the blockading of Kamchatka, and the occupation of the Kuriles. The sites of the maneuvers to be held by Japan and the United States have obviously been chosen to serve as a rehearsal for such exercises. For this reason, the locations are as near as possible to Soviet territory.

By the way, in referring to the nature of recent Japan-U.S. joint military maneuvers, Japanese military commentator Haruo Fujii characterized them as a show of force against the Soviet Union. What this representative of Japanese military affairs circles, who has consistently been taking delight in mouthing the theory of Soviet threat, meant to say is of great interest.

If we verify the facts, it is rather the Soviet side which indeed has to worry. From the scale and orientation of the Japan-U.S. joint maneuvers, we can certainly say that they are threatening. It is more than clear that the holding of such maneuvers completely runs counter to the interest of improving the situation in the Far East.

Further on Japanese Statement on Kurile Islands

OW2909021489 Moscow in Japanese to Japan
1200 GMT 20 Sep 89

[Text] According to a TASS News Agency report from Tokyo, Japan published a statement on 19 September as part of its unlawful territorial demand campaign. The statement, announced by Chief Cabinet Secretary Moriyama, calls for restraints on Japanese travelling to part of the Kurile Islands of the Soviet Union, which the Japanese Government claims as Japan's inherent Northern Territories.

The statement, prepared under the Japanese Foreign Ministry's guidance, cites as the reason the need to obtain Soviet visas for such travel and, in that case, the possibility of exercising political influence on Japanese-Soviet negotiations now under way, because such travel is regarded as a visit to Soviet territory.

YOMIURI SHIMBUN, dated 19 September, links this Japanese Government measure with recent introductory visits to the Kurile Islands by Japanese journalists.

KYODO News Service, meanwhile, reports that the Japanese Foreign Ministry tries to impress the people that Japanese nationals visited the Kurile Islands under Soviet propaganda maneuverings.

Last August, Kiyoshi Mizuno, director general of the Management and Coordination Agency, who is a cabinet member, was planning to visit Kunashiri Island, which is included in the northern territorial demand, together with a group of Japanese people authorized to visit their relatives' graves. According to a Soviet diplomatic source, the Soviet Embassy in Tokyo basically agreed to Director General Mizuno's travel. Nevertheless, as Director General Mizuno himself acknowledged, the Foreign Ministry opposed his visit for fear it might help hold good the interpretation that a cabinet member's travel is tantamount to the Japanese side's acknowledgement of the Soviet Union's legal rule over that island.

According to KYODO News Service, Japanese Foreign Minister Nakayama said that the statement in question would not affect Japanese-Soviet relations, and the one who prepared the statement reconfirmed Japan's desire to establish stable relations between the two countries on the basis of true, mutual understanding.

At the same time, however, Foreign Minister Nakayama did not forget to make the conventional demand—a package return of the Northern Territories—as a precondition for conclusion of a Soviet-Japanese peace treaty and the development of mutually reciprocal relations.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Vietnamese General on Pullout, Cambodia Prospects

PM2809150989 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 23 Sep 89 p 3

[Interview with General Doan Khue, SRV deputy defense minister and chief of Vietnamese People's Army General Staff, by correspondent A. Romashko: "All Roads Lead Home"—date of interview not given, first paragraph is KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA introduction]

[Excerpts] The withdrawal of Vietnamese troops from Cambodia began 21 September. Our Hanoi correspondent A. Romashko met with General Doan Khue, SRV deputy defense minister and chief of the Vietnamese People's Army General Staff. [passage omitted]

[Romashko] Generally speaking, military presence on the territory of another state, irrespective of the aims—and that includes noble aims—which it may pursue, rarely meets with the support of the world public. Unfortunately, we know this from our own experience.

[Doan Khue] I quite agree. The introduction of foreign troops is not the best way of resolving international or domestic policy problems.

[Romashko] Today Vietnam is being mainly condemned not for "aggression" against the Pol Pot regime, but rather for "occupying" Cambodia for many years.

[Doan Khue] The presence of Vietnamese troops in Cambodia was, of course, a forced measure. Let politicians and diplomats analyze and argue about the political expediency of this step. As a military man I am convinced that, had the Vietnamese units left Cambodia immediately after the liberation, Pol Pot would have re-established his dictatorship. The people's authorities could not have defended themselves at that time. It was precisely this circumstance which dictated the new PRK [People's Republic of Kampuchea] Government's request for Vietnamese volunteers to remain in the country.

[Romashko] I understand you perfectly, but nonetheless, 11 years of military presence...

[Doan Khue] It was never our aim to stay in Cambodia "for good." Our presence was determined by two factors: the possibility of the re-establishment of the Pol Pot regime, and the combat potential of the Cambodian Army.

During these years we carried out several partial withdrawals of our troops as the military threat from the Pol Pot men diminished and the combat capability of the Cambodian Armed Forces increased.

[Romashko] Many Western media have claimed that the Vietnamese troops have been withdrawn only on paper, that after demonstrative marches they have again returned to their positions.

[Doan Khue] As a specialist I dare to claim that it is practically impossible to conceal large-scale redeployments of troops in present-day conditions. I believe that most people, even people who are not versed in military matters, understand that the situation in Cambodia, and above all the movements of our units and subunits, are being closely watched, and not by journalists alone. Furthermore, as from 1987 all partial withdrawals of troops were attended by foreign observers.

[Romashko] Nonetheless, it has been said and written more than once that Vietnam has drawn considerable benefit, both economical and political, from its military presence in Cambodia.

[Doan Khue] I can assure you that to maintain an army on foreign territory is very difficult and costly. I am not even referring to the loss of human life. What advantages can there be?

On the contrary, our servicemen gave a considerable amount of assistance to both their Cambodian colleagues and the civilian population. They built many roads and schools, repaired irrigation ditches, cleared mines from rice paddies, and helped to supply children's homes with food.

[Romashko] The final withdrawal of Vietnamese forces from Cambodia began 21 September. What course will it take?

[Doan Khue] Our troops are to be withdrawn between 21 and 26 September along six land routes, by sea, and by air. The command of four army zones, the remaining units of two infantry divisions, subunits of naval forces, staffs of an aviation regiment, and other units are returning home.

[Romashko] How many of them in all?

[Doan Khue] A total of 26,000 men. In addition to this, 24,000 Vietnamese servicemen left Cambodia between May and July of this year.

[Romashko] And so the last Vietnamese soldier is to leave Cambodia. How will events develop from now on?

[Doan Khue] We, the military, have discharged our duty toward the Cambodian people with honor. It is now up to the politicians. However, it should not be forgotten that, if the entire conflict around Cambodia had been confined to the presence of Vietnamese troops there, it could have been settled easily a long time ago. I fear that the "Khmers Rouge" may try once again to take revenge for their defeat in 1979. There are as yet no international guarantees to prevent the restoration of their sole power in the country.

[Romashko] Do you believe that events in Cambodia could develop along the lines of the "Afghan scenario?"

[Doan Khue] I very much hope that that will not happen....

Commentary on New Situation in Cambodia

BK2909081289 Moscow in Cambodian to Cambodia 1230 GMT 28 Sep 89

[Station commentary by Geliy Shakov]

[Text] As already reported, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Union issued a statement when Vietnam completed the withdrawal of its troops from Cambodia. This important military and political activity has prefaced a new stage of the situation in and around Cambodia. It has created a condition favorable to national reconciliation and the search for a solution to the Cambodian problem.

Comrade Geliy Shakov, our commentator, wrote:

First of all, let us note that this event was most resounding. Those who in the past used to disparage the activities of the Cambodian and Vietnamese Governments have now noted that the withdrawal was total and as scheduled. There was no possibility of anyone falsifying the event since the withdrawal took place under the gaze of representatives of governments, public organizations, and journalists of several countries.

Concerning the aspects of the situation in and around Cambodia, a good many international observers have come to the conclusion that a favorable condition has been created for negotiations between the conflicting Cambodian groups at regional and international levels. For this to happen, it is imperative to avoid the resurrection of the genocidal regime. This is a major task to perform, as many news sources have revealed that Pol Pot's soldiers made repeated attempts to cross the Cambodian-Thai border.

The Soviet Union has stated that in this new situation, what is most important is to prevent the worsening of the conflagration and to prevent the outbreak of a civil war in Cambodia. What measures should we take, then? First of all, we must cease foreign military aid to all warring Cambodian factions. This particularly concerns the Polpotists who wish to revive their genocidal regime through the use of force. In general, it is imperative to fend off all interference in the Cambodian people's internal affairs while allowing the latter to become the true masters of their own home.

Near East & South Asia

Shevardnadze Meets With Israeli Counterpart

Urges Direct Talks With PLO

LD2809171189 Moscow TASS in English 1652 GMT 28 Sep 89

[Text] New York September 28 TASS—Eduard Shevardnadze met Israeli Foreign Minister Moshe Arens at the United Nations headquarters today. After the meeting he replied to journalists' questions.

Shevardnadze said that he "urged Foreign Minister Arens to enter into direct talks and contacts with the Palestine Liberation Organisation, and proposed holding such a meeting on the territory of the Soviet Union."

"I believe that it would be a good meeting," the Soviet minister said.

In his replies Shevardnadze dwelled in detail on various aspects of the Middle East settlement.

Talks With Arens Detailed

LD2909104589 Moscow TASS in English 1017 GMT 29 Sep 89

[Text] New York September 29 TASS—In a meeting here Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and his Israeli counterpart Moshe Arens discussed the situation in the Middle East and the current prospects for settling the Arab-Israeli conflict.

The Soviet side set out specific proposals and various actions that could be taken in order to start a dialogue between the conflicting parties within the framework of the efforts to prepare and convene an international conference.

It was stated that only a comprehensive settlement with the participation of all sides concerned, including the Palestine Liberation Organisation, and a fair solution of the key Palestinian problem could secure a lasting peace and reliable security for all nations and peoples in that region, including Israel.

Arens set out the Israeli Government's view on the issue of the Middle East peace settlement.

Both sides reaffirmed the intention to continue contacts and dialogue, above all on Middle East issues.

They also discussed bilateral issues connected, specifically, with the activity of the two countries' consular groups in Moscow and Tel Aviv.

Queried on Dialogue With Israel

LD2909030189 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2345 GMT 28 Sep 89

[Text] New York, 29 Sep (TASS)—After a meeting with Israeli Foreign Minister Moshe Arens, ended on

Thursday at the UN headquarters, Eduard Shevardnadze found himself surrounded by a large group of journalists accredited at this international organization. He replied to their questions.

Question: Why is it that up to the present time you have not made a decision on renewing relations with Israel?

Answer: The reasons for this are known. This is not the most important issue right now. I think that what is most important now is the fact that a dialogue is under way between representatives of the Soviet leadership and the Government of Israel on a sufficiently systematic basis. This is very important. An interesting and useful meeting also took place today which was held in a businesslike, constructive atmosphere. Without doubt attention was focused on the problems of a Middle East settlement. We set forth our positions, which are well known, on our priorities. Our position remains unchanged: We must bring things to the convocation of a conference to achieve an all-embracing and final settlement in the Middle East. We have spoken out in favor of starting consultations at the level of the five permanent members of the Security Council. This can be done on the level of experts in the initial stage.

We do not exclude the possibility of implementing the idea of elections. We have noted that there are rational elements in the proposals that were put forward by Prime Minister Shamir. There are also interesting elements in the proposals made by President Mubarak. We have said that recently the leaders of the PLO have taken very important steps in the interests of settling the conflict. You know this—these are recognition of the well known Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338. This is a very good basis for direct dialogue between the Palestinians and the Israeli leadership. This is a very good basis for dialogue. We are encouraging and supporting dialogue between the Palestinians and the U.S. Administration.

In other words, in spite of the dramatic nature of the situation in the Middle East, promising directions for a settlement are appearing in outline for all that. Constant dialogue, constant meetings are needed. All the interested parties must work actively, including the Soviet Union and the U.S. and other permanent members of the Security Council. We believe that the members of the European Community can do a great deal, and we are in constant contact with them and are consulting with them.

We have also discussed in a businesslike manner some aspects of bilateral relations, the issues of creating normal conditions for the functioning of consular groups now operating in our countries. Economic ties on a nongovernment level are possible at a given stage. Interesting prospects are also appearing in outline. So, I have told you almost everything that Mr Arens and I talked about.

Question: Since you have noted some positive elements in the proposals made by Prime Minister Shamir on elections in the occupied territories, why is it that you do not consider yourself in a position to support this plan?

Answer: This is not a question of the plan as a whole. I think that one must seek rational elements both in the proposals put forward by the prime minister and in the considerations expressed by the Egyptian president. But there is one fundamental issue. I spoke about this with the minister. There will not be a settlement if you allow the PLO to be ignored. The PLO is a real force. It is a force that needs to be reckoned with. There will not be a settlement without it.

Question: What are the positive elements that you see in the Shamir plan and in the Mubarak plan?

Answer: I have already spoken about them. The main idea is probably holding elections, but this is an idea. Everything has to be examined in a specific situation. In what kind of conditions will the elections be held? What part is the PLO playing? How is the idea of the self-determination of the Palestinian people embodied? These are all questions that need an answer and definite discussion.

Question: Are you hopeful that this time the tripartite committee on Lebanon will be able to achieve some kind of progress?

Answer: It can manage to make real progress because the platform the committee is proposing is a realistic one and is in principle supported by many states.

Question: What can you say with regard to the fact that Mr. Peres has been invited to visit the Soviet Union? Mr Borovik has invited Shimon Peres to visit the Soviet Union.

Answer: Borovik is the head of an independent organization—the Soviet Peace Committee—and as foreign minister I will not necessarily take part here in resolving this issue.

Question: But will you meet Mr Peres?

Answer: I have met him several times. If he is in the Soviet Union, I can meet him.

Question: Are you prepared to examine the question of the direct emigration of Jews from the Soviet Union to Israel, as Mr Arens proposed today?

Answer: The issue of emigration has in principle been resolved. Every person can determine where to go, where to head. As far as air travel is concerned, talks will have to be held on this question. There is Aeroflot. There is the corresponding Israeli firm. Talks must be held, taking into account commercial and financial interests. In principle we have come to an agreement on this—to resume talks on direct air travel.

Question: You have appealed directly to Mr Arens to accept the 10 points proposed by President Mubarak, haven't you? What was his reaction?

Answer: No, I appealed to Mr Arens to enter into direct contacts with the PLO. I'll tell you confidentially that I even offered my services to organize such a meeting on the territory of the Soviet Union. I think that that would be a good meeting and a sensation for journalists.

Question: But what did he say to that? What was his reaction?

Answer: You had better ask him that. Thank you.

'Danger' of U.S.-Israeli Military Accord Noted

LD2809175789 Moscow TASS in English 1646 GMT 28 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow September 28 TASS—By TASS political news analyst Albert Balebanov:

Israeli leaders, among them Prime Minister Yitzhak Shamir, like to talk about peace but stubbornly refuse to do anything concrete towards it.

At a session of the United Nations General Assembly Israeli Foreign Minister Moshe Arens urged his colleagues from Arab countries to take advantage of their stay in the U.S. to meet him to discuss ways of achieving Middle East peace.

And Arens insisted that the debates should centre on the "Shamir plan" which, as is known, does not solve the Palestinian problem, and is essentially aimed at perpetuating Israel's occupation of the West Bank of Jordan and Gaza Strip and, hence, of the Arab-Israeli conflict.

The day before Arens spoke in New York, the Pentagon admitted that the United States and Israel signed on September 8 an agreement allowing the administration to "lend" various military equipment to Israel.

This unusual agreement gives to Israel unlimited access to U.S. military arsenals.

What is more, the new agreement amends a 1983 U.S.-Israeli agreement on strategic cooperation and forms the basis for a new form of U.S. assistance to Israel in addition to the current annual 1.8 billion dollar military aid.

It should be noted that under the existing military agreement with the U.S. Israel has an opportunity to use U.S. military equipment deployed on its territory in an event of war.

The new "memorandum of understanding" considerably widens the framework of Israel's interaction with its chief strategic ally, the United States.

From now on, Tel Aviv will be able to use U.S. military equipment for any purpose, for instance, for suppressing the Palestinian uprising or for another raid on neighbouring Arab countries, and then return it to the Pentagon. There is no other way to interpret this agreement. There is no doubt that this unprecedented military cooperation of the U.S. and Israel poses a serious threat of destabilisation of the military-strategic and political situation in the Middle East.

And in view of the fact that Tel Aviv has recently tested its first medium-range nuclear missile, the new U.S.-Israeli agreement in the military area is fraught with serious danger for international peace and security.

Shevardnadze Receives PLO's Faruq Qaddumi

LD2809141689 Moscow TASS in English 1245 GMT 28 Sep 89

[Text] New York September 28 TASS—Eduard Shevardnadze received Faruq Qaddumi, Palestine Liberation Organisation Political Department head, here today.

During the meeting the sides thoroughly discussed the situation in the Middle East and ways of achieving a comprehensive settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict in general and the Palestinian problem in particular.

Shevardnadze pointed to the importance of stepping up efforts to advance the peace process in the region, taking into account the interests of all interested parties and using diverse approaches to the preparation for and convocation of an international conference.

Qaddumi confirmed the PLO's commitment to a constructive and realistic programme of actions, approved by the 19th session of the Palestine National Council and Palestinians' determination to strive for the exercise of their national rights.

While examining the pan-Arab situation, the sides expressed a unanimous opinion on the importance of normalising Syrian-Palestinian relations and pointed to the need to seek a political settlement of the Lebanese crisis.

The sides confirmed their intention to develop close Soviet-Palestinian cooperation and coordination in the interests of lasting peace and security in the Middle East.

Shevardnadze, Wakil Discuss Afghan Situation

LD2909110989 Moscow TASS in English 1041 GMT 29 Sep 89

[Text] New York September 29 TASS—In a substantive discussion Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevrdnadze and his Afghan counterpart 'Abdul Wakil stated that the eight months since the completion of the Soviet troop withdrawal from Afghanistan have convincingly proved the viability of the Kabul government.

Its consistent course towards a peaceful settlement of internal Afghan problems has also emerged as the sole way to end war and bloodshed.

The discussions in New York conducted by the two ministers with representatives of other countries and the very atmosphere around the Afghan delegation to the U.N. General Assembly demonstrate that the viability of the Kabul government is gaining growing international recognition.

There is much concern, however, over the violation of the Geneva accords by U.S. arms deliveries to the opposition via Pakistani territory.

The importance of strengthening the role of the U.N. and its secretary-general in the search for approaches towards establishing peace on Afghan soil has been unanimously stressed.

Iran's 'Positive' Stance on Afghanistan Praised

NC2809213489 Moscow in Persian to Iran 1500 GMT 28 Sep 89

[Report on commentary by (Mikhail Glebov) from "The World Today"]

[Text] As we previously reported, the Iran-based Afghan opposition groups are not insisting on Najibullah's resignation from the Afghan presidency as a definite condition for the formation of a government on a wide democratic basis. These remarks were made by S.K. Singh, Indian deputy minister of external affairs, who met with the leaders of the eight Shiite mujahidin organizations during his visit to Tehran. (Mikhail Glebov), Soviet analyst on Middle East affairs, writes on this:

One may argue and discuss any subject and one may have any view one wants. Views may be different. But there are things that everyone should inevitably accept. For example, it is now clear to everyone that the ending of the bloodshed in Afghanistan has become something that cannot be postponed. The outcome of the conflict in Afghanistan is truly tragic: hundreds of thousands of people killed and wounded, millions of refugees living in refugee camps in Iran and Pakistan, and dozens of cities and villages destroyed by shelling and missile attacks. Under these circumstances, each new day of war is a crime.

It seems that more and more mujahidin are understanding this every day. In particular, the recent statement by the eight-party alliance shows that the groups that make up this alliance want talks to begin in order that a way may be found out of the current complicated situation.

Clearly, such negotiations will not be complete or carry weight without the participation of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan and President Najibullah, who leads this party. The representatives of the Afghan opposition in Iran have admitted this.

The new approach of the eight-party alliance on the normalization of the situation in Afghanistan is unexpected only at first glance. Actually, this approach is the outcome of long and detailed talks between the Shiite opposition and the Afghan Government. In early September, Najibullah and Keshtmand sent a letter to the Iran-based mujahidin leaders calling on them to hold talks. Apparently this time the peace-loving initiative of the Afghan leadership was understood.

One should also not rule out the possibility that Tehran, too, had something to do with the change in the Shiite opposition's stance. We know that a week before their statement, the leaders of the eight-party alliance met with Iran's 'Ali Akbar Velayati. During this meeting the Iranian foreign minister pointed out to the opposition leaders that his country is making great efforts for a solution of the Afghan problem. Apparently Iran, which did not recognize the interim government, is ready to help toward extensive talks among all Afghan forces.

Moreover, the Iranian Government announced that it is determined to cooperate with other regional countries to end the bloodshed in Afghanistan. In particular, last month Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze discussed this issue with Iran's President 'Ali Akbar Hashemi-Rafsanjani. After the talks, he pointed out that currently Tehran has adopted a positive stance on the Afghan conflict and he described the Islamic Republic's realism as positive. A joint communique stated that the two countries' stances on the Afghan issue have become a good deal closer.

Tehran's mediation and the readiness of the Shiite opposition groups for concession and peace: These are good and favorable grounds for constructive talks with Kabul.

It seems that a true opportunity for a peaceful solution of the Afghan issue has arisen; and now the most important thing is for this opportunity not to be lost.

'Concern' Over Rafsanjani's 'Hostile' Remarks

NC2809211589 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Persian to Iran 1530 GMT 28 Sep 89

[Report on (Nikolay Marozov) commentary]

[Excerpts] The Soviet public has heard the hostile remarks that are being made in Tehran. During the period of a week, Iran's President Hashemi-Rafsanjani twice very clearly implied that he does not rule out the possibilty of a resumption of war operations against Iraq. This warning was first heard in the president's official remarks over Tehran radio and then repeated in his message to the Armed Forces on the ninth anniversary of the commencement of the war in the Persian Gulf.

Our commentator (Nikolay Marozov) points out that the brief reports gleaned from the pages of the Soviet organ IZVESTIYA give rise to a certain degree of concern. [passage omitted]

Marozov writes: The United Nations, including our country as a permanent member of the Security Council, exerted great efforts to achieve a cease-fire and an end to the war in the Middle East. It was as a result of joint efforts that the generally comprehensive Resolution 598 of the Security Council was compiled. Moreover, a series of initial steps for its implementation were successfully carried out. Guns stopped roaring throughout the entire region. Hundreds of prisoners of war returned to their homelands and, most important of all, millions of people on both sides of the Iran-Iraq border breathed a sigh of relief under a sky that was once again blue and secure.

Neighboring countries also felt relief. The efforts of all the Arabs to bring about a solution to the Near East problem and to end the Lebanese impasse were activated. The Soviet public, too, regarded the peaceful process between Iran and Iraq with satisfaction. Longstanding good relations link us with both these countries. We have common borders with Iran, and Iraq is also not very far from the Soviet borders. We are sincerely happy, like any neighbor, to see the people working and happy, and to see them strive for (?welfare).

War is an abnormal situation and contrary to (?law). Probably both the Iranians and the Iraqis understand this reality. It would be an immense tragedy if Tehran and Baghdad were suddenly to upset the process of political solution and resort to arms once again.

Our commentator Nikolay Marozov concludes: It is especially because of this that the Soviet public feels concern over the hostile remarks by the Iranian president.

Velayati on Need To Eliminate Chemical Weapons

NC2809192289 Moscow in Persian to Iran 1500 GMT 28 Sep 89

[From "The World Today" feature]

[Excerpts] The speech by Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze at the 44th UN General Assembly session had extensive repercussions among the participants in this session. Our correspondent (Sergey Levskiy) reports from New York:

The Soviet foreign minister's proposals on reducing the arsenals of chemical weapons received great attention. [passage omitted] U.S. Secretary of State James Baker pointed out that a response was given to President George Bush's initiative on chemical weapons in Eduard Shevardnadze's speech. James Baker then said that the Soviet foreign minister's speech was extremely interesting, and that of course all its details would be carefully studied.

Our correspondent goes on to say: It should be recalled that in his speech to the UN General Assembly on Monday, the U.S. President stated that the United States is prepared to reduce chemical weapons by 80 percent until an international agreement on banning this weaponhas been reached, if the Soviet Union agrees to reciprocate. For his part, Shevardnadze pointed out that the Soviet Union is prepared to go even further than the U.S. initiative and to completely end the production of chemical weapons. The Soviet Union also proposes that the Soviet and U.S. chemical weapons be radically reduced or completely eliminated on the basis of reciprocal steps. Meanwhile, the Soviet Union and the United States should agree not to use such weapons under any circumstances. Shevardnadze pointed to the need to establish serious controls in order to end the production of chemical weapons and ensure their elimination.

The UN members attached great significance to the important jump toward chemical disarmament. [passage omitted] Iran's Foreign Minister 'Ali Akbar Velayati believes that all countries of the world, especially the superpowers, should jointly and sincerely cooperate toward the elimination of chemical weapons.

In their reaction to Eduard Shevardnadze's speech, the participants in the UN General Assembly point to the fact that a vast spectrum of international issues was brought up in this speech. [passsage omitted)

Commentary on Arrests, Situation in Sudan

EA2709120789 Moscow International Service in Somali 1600 GMT 25 Sep 89

[Vladimir Borisov commentary]

[Text] Reports from Khartoum say, that members of the Sudanese Communist Party have been jailed. AL-INQADH AL-WATANI, a weekly paper, said this in an interview last Sunday with Ibrahim Nayil Adam, in charge of the Sudanese Military Security Bureau.

This is the first time members of a political party have been detained, if detentions of party leaders of the deposed regime are excluded, since the 30 June coup. This is the first time party members have been jailed, but will it be the last? This question is worrying all observers of the situation in Sudan. The people, who have been jailed, according to General Adam, because they have been causing chaos and challenging the Sudanese National Salvation Revolutionary Council, are predominantly members of the Communist Party, the junta alleges. What is this chaos they have been causing? Is it a parliamentary debate, peaceful demonstration, or armed struggle?

The spokesman for the Sudanese regime has given no details on this matter. He has not even given the names of the people detained or said when they were detained. You can agree with us that this is, of itself, worrying. However, in the interview he gave there were contradictions. Gen Adam said that John Garang, the leader of the Sudanese People's Liberation Army [SPLA], sympathizes with the Communist Party, and its members are his supporters.

As is known, the SPLA has been waging an armed struggle for 6 years against the Islamization imposed on southern Sudan, where the majority of citizens are Christians and followers of other religions. Whatever idea one may hold as to what John Garang is struggling for, everybody is aware of his strong personality and that he freely stands up for his beliefs without coercion.

Even the leaders of the Sudanese military government have recently acknowledged this. The Army has the quality of openmindedness and the capability to solve the worst situation. Garang has such qualities as well. This was said in an interview given by 'Umar al-Bashir, the Sudanese leader. He said this just a few days after the coup took place.

The Sudanese military leadership has, many times, promised Colonel Garang peace negotiations with the government and later, a role in the peace committee, currently working to find a solution to the country's southern problems. The leader of the SPLA has rejected the government proposals. He proposed to the military government that first the country's courts should suspend the practice of shari'ah law and that political parties and trade unions should be allowed to function. In Sudan, it is not just the Communist Party which has been banned, but all political parties.

In his interview, Gen Ibrahim Nayil Adam, pointed out that the military leadership was not going to release the members of the former government, including members of the Al-Umma Party and the Democratic Unionist Party. In the interview, Gen Adam condemned Communists as troublemakers. He identified them with the current difficult situation in the country. This situation has been made even more difficult by military rule, the problem in the south, price increases on many essential commodities, and the military regime's lack of a program to revitalize the country's ailing economy.

Pallayev-Led Delegation Arrives in Morocco

LD2809184189 Moscow TASS in English 1719 GMT 28 Sep 89

[Text] Rabat September 28 TASS—A Soviet parliamentary delegation led by G. Pallayev, vice-president of the USSR Supreme Soviet and president of the Presidium of Tajikistan's Supreme Soviet, has arrived here on an official visit at the invitation of Morocco's Chamber of Representatives (parliament).

The Soviet parliamentarians are expected to discuss with their Moroccan counterparts and members of the Moroccan Government a wide range of issues of cooperation between the two countries' supreme legislatures and further prospects for strengthening friendly Soviet-Moroccan relations.

The sides will also examine urgent international issues, including joint steps to strengthen peace and detente, ways of solving regional conflicts and the situation in the Middle East, the Mediterranean, Africa and other issues of mutual interest.

The head of the Soviet delegation said in a statement on arrival in Rabat that the current visit would help strengthen good relations, which had linked the two countries and their supreme legislatures for many years.

He expressed hope that the forthcoming talks would develop the fruitful contacts, strengthen the coincidence of views of the sides and serve the cause of mutual enrichment. The revival of mutually advantageous cooperation between the Soviet Union and Morocco in political and other fields holds out much promise, Pallayev stressed.

The Soviet deputies were met by Mohammed Jalal al-Said, first deputy president of the Chamber of Representatives, and other officials.

East Europe

Shevardnadze Meets Hungarian Foreign Minister

LD2809111889 Moscow TASS in English 1107 GMT 28 Sep 89

[Text] New York September 28 TASS—At a meeting held here between Eduard Shevardnadze and Hungarian Foreign Minister Gyula Horn, the sides exchanged opinions on ways to improve forms and methods of Soviet-Hungarian economic cooperation.

They also discussed multilateral cooperation within the CMEA to overcome the economic division of the world and to achieve a closer integration of the two countries' economies into the system of world economic relations.

The ministers informed each other of political and economic reforms in the USSR and Hungary. They expressed confidence that, despite difficulties and problems, the reforms that are of vital interests to the two nations would be realised successfully.

It was pointed out that the present stage of European development requires a sharp response to all manifestations capable of arresting the favourable trends towards understanding and confidence that are gaining momentum in Europe.

Yakovlev Holds Talks With Bulgaria's Zhivkov

LD2809151889 Moscow TASS in English 1503 GMT 28 Sep 89

[Text] Sofia September 28 TASS—International affairs, the development of socialism and cooperation among socialist countries were discussed in Varna during a meeting between Todor Zhivkov, Bulgarian Communist Party chief and president of Bulgaria's State Council, and Soviet Politbureau Member and Central Committee Secretary Aleksandr Yakovlev.

Yakovlev is leading a delegation of the Soviet Communist Party at the Conference of Secretaries of Central Committees of Fraternal Parties of Socialist Countries on International Affairs held here.

The Bulgarian leader emphasized with particular satisfaction that the main goals and directions of radical restructuring implemented in every area of social life in Bulgaria and the Soviet Union coincide in principle.

He noted that new broad opportunities are now being created to upgrade all-round cooperation between the two fraternal countries to use new forms of closer interaction between the Bulgarian Communist Party and the Soviet Communist Party in the interests of socialism and peace.

It was noted at the meeting that in accordance with new political thinking, unity and interaction of socialist countries are based not on mechanical unification but on a creative quest for solutions required by real interests, for which favourable opportunities are created on a common socialist foundation.

Coordination of actions between fraternal parties and states on matters of principle, comradely interest in the success of partners, precise fulfilment of obligations and profound understanding of national and international interests in their organic link, are all of priority importance, the sides agreed.

It was noted that socialist integration and the widening of economic cooperation between socialist ccountries, as the material basis of their unity, is of much importance.

The sides agreed that the stepping up of political activity of socialist countries on the international scene is an outstanding phenomenon showing the effectiveness of new political thinking in international relations.

This is proved convincingly by their major initiatives for disarmament and consolidation of peace and cooperation in Europe and the whole world, for the solution of global problems of humanity, protection and development of world civilisation.

Yazov Greets Bulgaria on Army Anniversary

PM2809095989 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 23 Sep 89 First Edition p 1

[Greetings USSR Defense Minister D. Yazov to Bulgarian counterpart on Bulgarian Army anniversary]

[Text] To Army General Comrade Dobri Dzhurov, Bulgarian minister of national defense

Esteemed Comrade Minister!
On behalf of the Armed Forces of the Soviet Union and on my own behalf, I cordially greet you and all the servicemen of the fraternal Bulgarian People's Army on the 45th anniversary of its formation.

We note with deep satisfaction that the Bulgarian People's Army, in close friendly alliance with the Warsaw Pact armies, is vigilantly and reliably protecting the peaceful and constructive labor of the Bulgarian people and making a worthy contribution to ensuring the security of all the allied countries. The continuing process of deepening fraternal ties between the armies of Bulgaria and the Soviet Union sincerely gladdens us.

On the glorious anniversary I wish all the staff of the Bulgarian People's Army new successes in improving military expertise for the good of Bulgaria and in the name of peace and socialism.
[Signed] Army General D. Yazov, USSR minister of defense

Bulgaria's Dzhurov Comments on Army Cuts, Turkey

PM2809145189 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 23 Sep 89 First Edition p 5

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA interview with Bulgarian National Defense Minister Army General Dobri Dzhurov under the rubric: "On the 45th Anniversary of Bulgarian People's Army": "On the Southern Borders"; date, place of interview not given; last paragraph is editorial conclusion]

[Text] [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] This September the Bulgarian people celebrate two significant dates—the 45th anniversary of the socialist revolution in Bulgaria and the 45th anniversary of the creation of the Bulgarian People's Army. How are the people and servicemen greeting these events? What did September 1944 mean for you personally?

[Dzhurov] Bulgarian People's Army servicemen and commanders realize that we are living in a restless world full of contradictions and surprises and that the danger of war still exists. That is why they devote great efforts to the cause of increasing combat skill and boosting combat readiness to a qualitatively new level.

These days ceremonial meetings are being held in the country. On the 45th anniversary of our Army's creation barracks, testing ranges, shooting ranges, and tank training areas will open their doors to visitors. Servicemen's relatives and friends will be able to acquaint themselves with soldiers' living and recreational conditions and with the history of troop units and formations.

For me September 1944 was a time of joy and of meetings with people who had obtained their sought-after freedom. I will not undertake to describe everything that happened—the shining faces, the firm embraces, the cries of "hurrah." The population's meeting with the troops of the glorious Red Army, which brought Bulgaria freedom, was a real people's holiday. I think that our grandfathers were equally delighted during the Russo-Turkish war of liberation (1877-1878) when, having crossed the snowy mountain passes, the troops under Generals Gurko and Skobelev along with hundreds of Cossacks entered Bulgarian cities and villages after heavy fighting. The people greeted them hospitably with ecclesiastical banners and showered them with cordial warmth.

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] Changes are now taking place in the Bulgarian People's Army. After the Army cutbacks, how will the Bulgarian People's Army maintain supreme combat readiness and guarantee reliable defense for the Bulgarian people's peaceful labor?

[Dzhurov] In accordance with the overall trend toward detente, the Bulgarian State Council and Council of Ministers in their resolution of 27 January 1989 decided to reduce the country's 1989 military budget by 12 percent and unilaterally reduce some of its armed forces and arms by the end of 1990. Provision was also made for a corresponding reduction in the managerial composition of the Defense Ministry and individual branches of the Armed Forces.

One can now hear the opinion that, under conditions of a reduced level of military confrontation and the Warsaw Pact's perceptible unilateral reductions in armed forces and arms, the Army is becoming outdated as an instrument of the state and armed forces allegedly have no future and should be abolished. Under contemporary conditions militarism does not indeed have any future. But that by no means signifies that the Army has resolved its tasks. Today and in the future, the Bulgarian People's Army guards our people's socialist gains. It must protect the southern borders of the socialist community.

The following question is quite logical: How will the Army be able to maintain its supreme combat readiness after the unilateral reductions? The answer to this is closely linked with the results that we hope to receive from restructuring within the troops. In accordance with the decisions of the 13th Bulgarian Communist Party [BCP] Congress of 1986 and the provisions of the July (1987) Concept, the National Defense Ministry has elaborated a long-term program and plans for the implementation of restructuring within the Army at all levels. We believe that the fulfillment of this program will make it possible to obtain more qualitative training for military personnel in the new conditions with a smaller number of Army personnel and arms—they will be able to successfully resolve their tasks of defending the homeland and socialism.

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] We know that peace at home often depends not only on relations within the family but also on relations with neighbors. What are Bulgaria's relations like with its neighbors in the Balkans? How do these mutual relations affect the creation of the common European home?

[Dzhurov] Bulgaria is a Balkan state and attaches particular significance to relations with other states in the region. We are vitally interested in consolidating peace and in developing mutually beneficial cooperation among the states of the Balkan peninsula. Bulgaria bases its policy on elements that promote rapprochement among these countries. Our policy is consistent, is not subject to any conditions of expediency, and is devoid of national egoism. It accords with the ideas of creating a common European home and asserting this idea in a region well-known in the recent past as the powder keg of Europe.

Bulgaria proposed that the Balkan states sign (bilateral) agreements containing a code for good-neighborly relations—in particular, the renunciation of territorial claims and the banning of the use of one country's territory against another. We believe that in accordance with the Helsinki Final Act it is possible to conclude bilateral agreements on the nonuse of force in relations between Balkan states and the peaceful resolution of contentious issues. Ideas about turning the Balkans into a nuclear and chemical weapons-free zone have become widely known (Bulgaria is the coauthor of these ideas), as have the proposal about signing a declaration on not siting nuclear weapons on the Balkan countries' territory and on reducing and eliminating these weapons in those areas where they exist, and the proposal to convene an assembly of the Balkan peoples, and so on. Bulgaria has made a substantial contribution to the development of cooperation in the Balkans in such spheres as ecology, the economy, and culture and in the humanitarian sphere. Bulgaria's active stance on these questions is confirmed by its participation in certain general Balkan initiatives.

While maintaining multilateral contacts, Bulgaria is also making efforts to develop cooperation with every Balkan country individually. Our relations with Romania, Yugoslavia, and Greece have become more active. A working meeting between Todor Zhivkov, general secretary of the BCP Central Committee, and the Greek prime minister was held 22-23 April 1989 on the Bulgarian-Greek border. Progress in Bulgarian-Greek relations also applied to the military sphere. Military delegations headed by the chiefs of staff of the two countries' armies have been exchanged. Changes have also been mapped out in relations between Bulgaria and Albania. Our relations with Turkey are going through a period of stagnation —Bulgaria is not to blame for this, moreover. Even though the Bulgarian-Turkish protocol on good-neighborliness and cooperation signed in February 1988 creates conditions for stepping up dialogue. Unfortunately, the Turkish side tried to use that document as a means of interfering in Bulgaria's internal affairs, and when these attempts failed the document was described in Turkey as "stillborn." Turkey distorted the sense of the protocol signed and violated its provisions. People in Ankara are making attempts to blacken Bulgaria in the eyes of the world public, particularly the Islamic states. Turkey is calling for Bulgaria to be isolated and is trying to set other states against our country. Such actions contravene the demands of the new political thinking.

Bulgaria is fully determined to continue to adhere to its course in the future—and help stabilize the situation in the Balkans and throughout the world and broaden and deepen cooperation among peoples in the spirit of the new political thinking and on the basis of respect for national sovereignty. Our country believes that common efforts are needed to eliminate destabilizing factors and elements of suspicion in relations between Balkan states. Bulgaria is doing everything in its power to build the "Balkan" layer of our common European home.

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] Fraternity makes you strong. These are Shota Rustaveli's words, but they have a direct bearing on the fraternal ties between our countries and our armies and Bulgaria's people and Army. In your view, what further ways are there of developing the international ties between our peoples and armies and the Warsaw Pact as a whole?

[Dzhurov] The friendship between the Soviet and Bulgarian peoples, the BCP and the CPSU and the friendship between our armies are deeply rooted in history. Love for the Land of the Soviets and for Soviet people is a sacred feeling for every Bulgarian, passed down from generation to generation.

We associate the BCP's steadfast course of unity and collaboration with the Soviet Union under the new revolutionary conditions with the development and strengthening of the unity and fraternal cohesion of the socialist countries and above all the Warsaw Pact states. In this respect our stance fully accords with what Shota Rustaveli said. But we Bulgarians have a motto which is inscribed on the facade of the National Assembly building—"Strength in Unity." We are true to that motto.

The strength of our military-political alliance is based on the fraternal states' unified military policy, which aims to defend peace and socialism. Close cooperation is developing in the sphere of military science and military art and in the elaboration of military-patriotic views and a unified defense doctrine.

The principles on which the unity of the socialist countries and armies is based allocates a crucial role to the principle of socialist internationalism. This is the fundamental principle in our mutual relations. That is why great attention will continue to be paid to our military personnel's international education. The process of constant interdiffusion of socialist patriotism and socialist internationalism can be said to be currently under way in the Bulgarian People's Army. At the same time we believe that military personnel must be armed with sound knowledge so that they can successfully counter the influence of bourgeois ideology, ideological subversion, and psychological warfare. Attempts to undermine our unity and sow the seeds of mistrust and discord must be constantly and effectively opposed.

The comprehensive development of mutual ties within the framework of the Warsaw Pact and bilateral and multilateral relations among the fraternal countries open up prospects for the broadening of direct human contacts. Participation in joint events, economic work, military exercises, exchanges of students and specialists, and the joint resolution of the tasks of building and defending socialism all help to turn our countries' citizens from comrades in arms and allies into close friends. The broader the social foundation of the relations between our countries and peoples, the more ordinary people join in the various forms of international cooperation. The nationwide Bulgarian-Soviet friendship movement is an effective, independent, popular movement in our country. It embraces all spheres of public life and contains a particularly large fund for unity and friendship between our two peoples.

The socialist countries live and build their future in close alliance. As Comrade Gorbachev said, constant contacts between fraternal parties and peoples, comradely advice and exchange of experience, common decisions, and specific accords are needed to consolidate this alliance. I would like the political ties and contacts between our state and party leaders to continue to be intensive and fruitful. [Dzhurov ends]

The editorial board thanks SOFIA PRESS for their help in preparing the material.

Bulgarian Leaders Thank USSR for Congratulations

PM2809134389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
24 Sep 89 Second Edition p 1

[Bulgarian leaders' message of thanks to Soviet leadership organs]

[Text] To the CPSU Central Committee
To the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium
To the USSR Council of Ministers

Dear comrades,

Please accept the sincere gratitude of the Bulgarian Communist Party [BCP] Central Committee, Bulgarian State Council and Council of Ministers, and Bulgarian people for the cordial congratulations and wishes on our country's national holiday—45th anniversary of the socialist revolution.

The great cause of the 9 September 1944 victory, gained with the decisive assistance of the Soviet Army, is today continued and developed in the BCP's course of perestroyka and renewal of socialism and of the material and spiritual progress of the Bulgarian people.

We are profoundly convinced that on the basis of the common goals and tasks that are being tackled by the BCP and the CPSU, the broad and comprehensive cooperation between Bulgaria and the USSR and their foreign policy collaboration will strengthen and improve for the benefit of our two fraternal peoples and in the name of socialism and peace.

[Signed] Todor Zhivkov, general secretary of the BCP Central Committee and chairman of the Bulgarian State Council

Georgi Atanasov, chairman of the Bulgarian Council of Ministers

PRAVDA Reports PZPR, CPCZ Leaders' Talks

PM2809153989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Sep 89 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Meeting in Prague"]

[Text] Prague, 25 Sep—M. Rakowski, first secretary of the Polish United Workers Party [PZPR], has been here on a 1-day friendly working visit at the invitation of the Czechoslovak Communist Party [CPCZ] Central Committee. Talks were held with M. Jakes, general secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee.

The two party leaders briefed each other on the main tasks facing Communists in the two countries and the political and economic situations in Czechoslovakia and Poland. Questions of the development of CPCZ-PZPR cooperation were discussed, and topical international problems were examined.

The sides emphasized the significance of the traditional close cooperation between Czechoslovakia and Poland in all spheres. The importance of the further development and enrichment of Czechoslovak-Polish cooperation on the basis of respect for and implementation of existing accords was noted.

During the discussion of questions pertaining to international life, the sides highlighted the need for collaboration between socialist countries in all spheres. They expressed support for the peace-loving efforts of the USSR and other socialist states aimed at ensuring peace, reducing nuclear and conventional arms, and firmly establishing new approaches in international relations.

The Polish leader also met with President G. Husak of Czechoslovakia and L. Adamec, Czechoslovak Government premier.

Nikolay Shishlin Views Reforms in E. Europe

PM2809102689 Paris LIBERATION in French 22 Sep 89 p 4

["P.B." interview with Nikolay Shishlin, "CPSU Central Committee aide responsible for the East European countries"; place not given]

[Excerpt] Moscow—[Passage omitted] LIBERATION: From the Soviet viewpoint, is the present situation in Poland considered "normal?"

Nikolay Shishlin: What do you call "normal?" First, Poland is immersed in a serious political and economic crisis. The problem is how to extricate society from the crisis. Well, we have no answers to this problem, and it is up to the Poles to find it.

LIBERATION: Do you consider it normal for the Communist Party—which could be considered responsible for this "crisis"—to relinquish power?

Nikolay Shishlin: It is consistent with the Polish situation, though you might not consider it "normal" in relation to usual situations. Major transformations are under way in the socialist countries. They could have unexpected results. I believe that the surprises are not over yet.

LIBERATION: Can the Polish example be transferred? Do you believe that Communist Parties could relinquish power in other countries that they have led into crisis?

Nikolay Shishlin: Each country follows its own path, and in this respect the Polish example cannot be transferred. However, it is true that the Communist Parties must seriously examine ways of enhancing their influence, their authority.

LIBERATION: Do you believe Poland is still a "socialist" state?

Nikolay Shishlin: You know, we wonder whether we ourselves are a socialist state... It is undeniable that Poland took the socialist path after the war, that it adopted its own version of socialism—that is, the Stalinist model. However, the essential thing now is not this theoretical debate; the essential thing for the country is to surmount its crisis.

LIBERATION: Are the means and the kind of policy unimportant?

Nikolay Shishlin: It is up to them to choose the means.

LIBERATION: Does this mean that the USSR is indifferent about domestic political events occurring in the so-called "socialist" countries?

Nikolay Shishlin: We are not indifferent; we take a great interest in them. As far as we can, we want to help the processes to take place in the best possible way. But one of the bases of our new way of thinking is freedom of choice. And if we want to be honest with ourselves, it means that free elections can lead to different results from one country to another. This does not prevent us from not concealing our sympathy for the Communist Parties.

LIBERATION: Is there a limit that the socialist countries must not exceed in their domestic policies?

Nikolay Shishlin: Of course not. Having said that, there are certain geopolitical realities. They exist for Poland, for the FRG, for Hungary, for us.... The Mazowiecki government accepts them, too.

LIBERATION: Hitherto the East European countries have not asked to leave the Warsaw Pact, as the Baltic countries are asking to leave the Soviet Union. But is it theoretically possible for them to do so?

Nikolay Shishlin: Everything is possible, as long as it does not conflict with the laws of physics. We are gradually emerging from the world inherited from the war, from the past, and NATO and the Warsaw Pact are not untouchable and eternal. We are witnessing the building of a freer world. Our idea of a "common

European home" is no dream, but it is not a policy for Moscow alone; it must also be the policy of Paris, London, Bonn, and Berlin.

LIBERATION: In your opinion, is the socialist world now confined to its diplomatic and military dimension?

Nikolay Shishlin: I do not believe so. We must realistically examine the extent of our economic ties. But we also have many common values. The present page in our common history is undoubtedly contradictory and difficult, but it will provide further surprises.

LIBERATION: The speaker of the Hungarian parliament has recently invoked a future of neutrality for his country....

Nikolay Shishlin: Szuros? He always tries to be one jump ahead. This does not seem to me to be the most important issue for Hungary today. In that country there is to be, first, the Hungarian Socialist Workers Party congress, with a real danger of a split within the party; then, elections; and, last, a debate on the objective economic and political situation. I believe that Szuros' statement is primarily a domestic political move, a way of attracting attention.

LIBERATION: Would Hungary's neutrality conflict with "the laws of physics?"

Nikolay Shishlin: (Smiling) No, it would not conflict with the laws of physics.

LIBERATION: To illustrate Soviet "nonintervention" in specific terms, in view of this possibility of a split within the Hungarian party, is the CPSU content to watch what happens?

Nikolay Shishlin: At the official level, we do nothing. At another level, we do indeed believe that the main issue for Hungary—and for Poland—is how to unite efforts, not division. Having said that, politics has its own rationale, often far removed from theory.

LIBERATION: In the East German refugees affair the USSR has violently attacked the FRG but has said nothing about Hungary's decision...

Nikolay Shishlin: We have enough problems without trying to resolve Hungary's as well....

LIBERATION: Does that mean that the USSR does not challenge Hungary's decision?

Nikolay Shishlin: We can understand it, for several reasons. Hungary could not send all these refugees back to the GDR by force... I believe it cannot have been an easy decision for the Hungarians either. Especially since the problem did not arise overnight.

LIBERATION: Is the cause of the exodus to be sought solely in "West German propaganda," as TASS implied?

Nikolay Shishlin: No, of course not. That would be to overestimate West German propaganda, in any case. The answer is obvious. There is the population's dissatisfaction with the economic situation, the discontent with what is happening in the political situation in the GDR—all this played a part. But I am optimistic. I believe that the changes taking place in our country, as well as in other countries, will be useful. Borders between states will soon disappear.

LIBERATION: The USSR still officially pretends to have no special political preferences between particular states, even if their situations with regard to reforms are very different. Has this not become rather artificial?

Nikolay Shishlin: Your question is badly put. Every East European country is now a social laboratory, has its own experience of changes and transformations....

LIBERATION: Even Romania?

Nikolay Shishlin: Of couse, even Romania. It is a laboratory, even though I believe that it is a negative experiment (don't tell the Romanians that; they might be offended.) Our chief principle is noninterference. This does not mean that we are indifferent. But we do not want to repeat past mistakes. Having said that, we are well aware that the processes under way are not the same from one country to another. And we know that our own perestroyka was not hailed in all East European countries. But international life is not like a school where you allocate good or bad grades, and it would not be very productive for me to do so.

LIBERATION: One of the important aspects of perestroyka is the reappraisal of history. Strangely, the USSR has not officially revised its stance on the events of 1956 in Hungary or 1968 in Czechoslovakia.

Nikolay Shishlin: You cannot do everything overnight and, as you will understand, the reappraisal of the twenties, thirties, or forties is easier than that of the fifties, sixties, or seventies, which have direct repercussions on our present policy. We must be cautious, prudent. But the process is under way.

LIBERATION: Does that mean that the official analysis regarding Prague and Budapest is no longer what it was before 1985?

Nikolay Shishlin: Our present position is tat we are opposed to any use of troops in the socialist countries' internal affairs: I believe that says it all....

LIBERATION: Does that apply to the past as well as to the present?

Nikolay Shishlin: Of course....

West Europe

Shevardnadze Meets Counterparts in New York

Meets FRG's Genscher

LD2809121189 Moscow TASS in English 1156 GMT 28 Sep 89

[Text] New York September 28 TASS—Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze has met with his West German counterpart Hans-Dietrich Genscher to discuss major international issues and Soviet-West German relations.

The two ministers also discussed disarmament in light of the Soviet-U.S. meeting in Wyoming and new Soviet and U.S. initiatives on banning chemical weapons, put forward at the recent session of the U.N. General Assembly.

When discussing the situation in Europe and East-West relations, the ministers noted the historic importance of the current turn from confrontation to cooperation. They also stressed the responsibility of the Soviet Union and West Germany for further progress, leading to the building of common European home.

The meeting was held in a business-like and constructive atmosphere.

Talks With Austria's Mock

LD2909102189 Moscow TASS in English 0957 GMT 29 Sep 89

[Text] New York September 29 TASS—Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze has held talks with Austrian Foreign Minister Alois Mock to discuss the increased global role of the United Nations, including the use of its potential in settling regional conflicts.

They also discussed problems encountered at Vienna talks on the reduction of conventional armed forces and on confidence-building measures in Europe. It was pointed out that Austria, as the host country, can play a special role in securing the progress of these negotiations.

The ministers voiced satisfaction with Soviet-Austrian relations and declared a desire to assist their further development.

Meets Sweden's Andersson

LD2909101789 Moscow TASS in English 0954 GMT 29 Sep 89

[Text] New York September 29 TASS—Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze has held talks with his Swedish opposite number Sten Andersson, which paid special attention to ecological problems.

They also discussed specific issues of environmental protection in the Baltic region and expressed themselves in favour of promoting "regional solidarity" in tackling difficult ecological issues there.

As the ministers examined regional problems, they revealed identical or close views on approaches to an Arab-Israeli settlement, including the role of the Palestine Liberation Organisation in this process.

Assessing Soviet-Swedish relations, Shevardnadze and Andersson said they could serve as a model example of state-to-state contacts at the time of building a common European home.

The Swedish foreign minister supported the Soviet reform drive, while Shevardnadze said that the Swedish experience of social and economic development is being studied and analysed with interest in the Soviet Union.

The two ministers will continue their contacts. Shevardnadze invited Andersson to pay an official visit to the Soviet Union on November 10-11, 1989.

Speaks With Belgium's Eyskens

LD2909101389 Moscow TASS in English 0955 GMT 29 Sep 89

[Text] New York September 29 TASS—Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze has held talks with his Belgian counterpart Mark Eyskens to discuss the fundamental aspects of dynamic European developments.

It was pointed out that despite diverse problems facing the continent's nations on the way to a common European home, success in radically reducing weapons stockpiles will be decisive.

Shevardnadze expressed confidence that 1990 will prove the turning point in this respect. In order to achieve the set goal, it is essential to make bold political decisions and it is imperative that leaders at the highest levels join the negotiating process.

Eyskens agreed with this approach.

Shevardnadze in this connection drew his attention to the need to resolve the problem of tactical nuclear weapons in Europe without unwarranted delay.

The sides expressed a mutual desire to continue Soviet-Belgian contacts.

Meets Malta's Adami

LD2809121889 Moscow TASS in English 1150 GMT 28 Sep 89

[Text] New York September 28 TASS—Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze met Edward Fenech Adami, Maltese prime minister and foreign minister, here today. The sides discussed some key international problems, including the European process and the Mediterranean situation

Considerable attention was given to the prospect for building a "common European home". The sides pointed to the desirability of maintaining closer cooperation in ecology.

When discussing bilateral relations, they expressed, in principle, satisfaction with their state and confirmed a mutual desire for advance and more active use of available reserves, including those in the sphere of trade and economic cooperation.

Kohl Remarks to CDU Congress Viewed, Criticized

PM2809110989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Sep 89 First Edition p 5

[Yevgeniy Grigoryev dispatch under the rubric "Correspondent Comments": "Reading the 'Script,' or Something About Bonn's Predictability"]

[Text] Bonn—The recent Christian Democratic Union [CDU] Congress in Bremen is now being analyzed in FRG newspapers and journals.

Some of them conclude that it was a great victory for Federal Chancellor H. Kohl, chairman of the main ruling party. Primarily because any opposition to the CDU leader was routed there. In the opinion of DER SPIEGEL, the congress did not provide an answer to the "challenge of the 1990's," about which so much was said on the platform. Instead of this landmarks were placed on "the road to the right," and there was a sense of a flirtation with right-wing radical elements. The reorganized party leadership used the Bremen forum to begin the lengthy election marathon meant to ensure success at the Bundestag elections in 1990.

The domestic political thrust of the CDU Congress prompted the West German mass media almost to ignore its foreign policy aspects. But it is worth returning to them. Especially since they were formulated as an entire program in H. Kohl's report.

The first aim identified by the chancellor is to attain a united Europe in which the split of our continent would be overcome in conditions of freedom. Freedom, self-determination, and unity for all Germans were identified as the next task. He stated that the beginning of a new epoch in Europe can be foreseen. And the FRG must be able to substantially influence its formation. In the same breath the chancellor proclaimed the "end of communist ideology." In his words, "the social system of the social market economy enjoys increasing recognition" in the countries of East and Southeast Europe. "It is precisely our ideas which are making headway on the continent and throughout the world—the ideals of the CDU," its chairman claimed. Of course, you may smile at the recollection of the former saying that "German essence [sushchnost] will cure the entire world." But all the same the aforementioned passages regarding the foreign policy sphere are not so inoffensive in our times. They do not indicate a deideologization of interstate relations. On the contrary, ideological approaches in international affairs are stressed. This is fine if these views remain just an election declaration. But what if they are included in the practice of Bonn's foreign political activity?

In his report the chancellor attached the greatest significance to the process of transformations in Europe's socialist countries. He talked about the "General Secretary Gorbachev's desire for radical transformations in his country, openness in the Soviet Union, and its inclusion in international cooperation."

Talking about the aim of achieving "a lasting and just all-European order," Kohl recalled that "this outstanding aim is enshrined in the Bonn joint statement" by the Soviet Union and the FRG. But this is only mentioned for the sake of the subsequent statement that "in contrast to the Moscow treaty, ways to peacefully overcome the status quo and the division of Europe are jointly designated in it."

However, as is well known, the following is clearly stated in the joint statement: "The Moscow treaty of 12 August 1970 remains the basis of the two states' relations. The sides will make full use of the potential contained in this treaty and other agreements." Why then did he have to confuse the issue?

The core of the Moscow treaty is the recognition of existing European borders and their inviolability now and in the future as a mandatory condition of peace in Europe. One wonders: Why counterpose two basic documents in an obvious attempt to devalue the Moscow treaty?

To be frank, some formulas and hints between the lines in the foreign policy part of the report delivered by the CDU chairman in Bremen suggest that this party's policy is not above hoping to play on the difficulties and complexities arising in the socialist countries during the process of transformations, turn some of them against others, and primarily destabilize the GDR. Admittedly, DER SPIEGEL believes that the "rulers in Bonn, in spite of all their speeches about reunification, believe that such a dramatic development is inconceivable and above all undesirable in the foreseeable future." Nonetheless, how should the following statement made by Kohl in Bremen be interpreted: "We have never been so close to implementing this aim—provided that we correctly determine the priorities and do not put forward certain questions at an unsuitable time"? What priorities? What questions? I would not like to think that this means, for example, questions like those raised recently by Waigel, chairman of the Christian Social Union, relating to the "1937 borders." At any case this looks like the formula of saying one thing but meaning another. But does this look like a predictable policy?

Let us note once more that all this has been set out in the Bremen report by the CDU chairman primarily for internal consumption, as an election propaganda line. There are reasons to believe that Bonn on the whole has not lost sight of reality and common sense. But everyone realizes that domestic policy is not walled off from foreign policy, they cannot fail to be interwoven and cannot fail to affect each other. Hence the questions....

CDU Warned Off Reviving 'German Question'

PM2809142989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Sep 89 Second Edition p 5

[A. Pavlov commentary: "On the Wrong Track"]

[Text] A regular congress of the Christian Democratic Union (CDU) was held in the FRG recently. This was no ordinary event, if you consider that the CDU is the ruling party and that the congress was clearly held with an eye to next year's Bundestag elections. But it was not only and so not much by virtue of this that it attracted attention both within the country itself and abroad. One could not fail to be struck by the attempts of several CDU figures to revive the so-called German question and move it into the forefront, using an arbitrary interpretation of the present situation in Europe as their point of departure.

A number of questions have arisen in connection with the CDU congress—not only in the Soviet Union but also, if the foreign press is anything to go by, among many of the FRG's neighbors and others besides.

How, for example, are we to interpret the idea expressed in the speech by CDU Chairman Helmut Kohl that the time has come to review the status quo in Europe? According to him, the Moscow Treaty is based on certain preconditions and now the situation is changing. A new era is supposed to be beginning in Europe, distinguished by the "collapse of socialism and the triumph of CDU ideas." Of course, prophesies like these, to which CDU ideologues have resorted more than once before, could be dismissed as the usual party rhetoric. But the speaker clearly overstepped the bounds of correctness, to put it mildly, when he tried to distort the spirit and meaning of the joint Soviet-West German statement signed in Bonn on 13 June this year.

In the opinion of the main speaker and a number of other speakers, the FRG is now closer than it has ever been to fulfilling the "idea of one Germany."

According to the concept proclaimed at the congress, the European Community countries must also be harnessed to the old Adenauer cart of great-power ambitions and try to drag it onto the highways of European international policy for the sake of resolving the task of swallowing up the GDR and bringing about the collapse of socialism. The appeals made at the CDU congress leave a rather strange impression. After all, the FRG Government has officially said more than once that the question of the Germans' national unity is not on the agenda of international politics. It was right to say that, because there are no real preconditions for the unification of the GDR and the FRG. In any case, one can quite definitely say that, if Bonn seriously intends to arm itself with these illusory ideas taken from the storerooms of the past, all the serious consequences of this political adventurism will be felt by the FRG first and foremost.

CDU strategists and tacticians should not flatter themselves: Events are not going to develop in the direction they would like. They should not forget the real correlation of forces and the potential of the sides, nor should they forget that the GDR is an important factor of peace and stability in Europe, an inalienable link in the Warsaw Pact, and our loyal friend and ally.

It also should not be forgotten that the FRG's relations with socialist countries—and the whole Helsinki process for that matter—are based on recognition of and respect for all the realities which shape the face of Europe today. If someone in the CDU decides that the time has come to question all these realities, the things most likely to be questioned are trust in the FRG, prospects for the development of its relations with a number of European countries, and its wish to walk with everyone else along the path of building a common European home, working for disarmament, and eliminating the enemy image—in short, everything connected with forming a Europe of peace and cooperation. Is that what the FRG wants?

No one is disputing that Europe and all political life on the continent need to be substantially renewed and, thanks to the efforts of all European states, the United States, and Canada, this process is becoming increasingly dynamic with every year. The transformation of Europe is conceivable only if we work with one another rather than against one another. This fact, incidentally, is well known to the FRG Government and it has publicly confirmed this more than once, notably in its joint statement with the Soviet Union.

No, the joint statement of 13 June this year is not concerned with overcoming the existing status quo in Europe—and certainly not in the sense that some circles in the CDU would now like to impart to it. This truly unique document talks about creating a common European home and building a Europe of peace and cooperation. The European states, the statement says, can and must live together without fear of one another and in peaceful competition with one another. It is precisely for this reason that the joint statement proclaims unconditional respect for the integrity and security of every state and the right of each to freely choose its own political and social system to be the first essential element of this development. It is also no accident that the joint statement specially emphasizes that the Moscow Treaty of 12 August 1970 remains the foundation of relations between the two states. After all, it was in this treaty that the sides clearly pledged to "strictly observe the territorial integrity of all states in Europe within their present borders."

There is a broad field of activity and a broad field of cooperation between the Soviet Union and the FRG. The positive development of Soviet-West German relations really has central significance both for Europe and for East-West relations as a whole.

The people of the FRG, like people the world over, are tired of the "cold war." They demonstrated this during

M.S. Gorbachev's visit to the FRG, warmly welcoming the policy of new thinking, which opens up real hopes for the creation of peace based on equality, mutual respect, and cooperation. Let us hope that these attitudes and aspirations are properly reflected in Bonn's policy, that a sense of commitment to pledges made will prevail, and that the FRG will make a contribution to building a Europe of peace and cooperation—a contribution commensurate with its role and responsibility.

West Germany Accused of 'Propaganda Campaign'

LD2809023689 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1540 GMT 27 Sep 89

[From "The World Today" program presented by Igor Fesunenko]

[Text] A propaganda campaign against the GDR which has been unleashed in the FRG of late is growing and quickly leading to a deterioration of relations between the two countries. Seeking to stimulate further emigration of GDR citizens to West Germany, the FRG press is publishing a flow of materials—like these reports [video shows pages from a DER SPIEGEL report] and some of them even insult the worth of the socialist German state. More and more frequently, hostile notes and monotonous exultations of capitalism are heard in these reports.

But it has to be said that at the same time, sober voices are also heard in the FRG. Krieger, the cochairperson of the Green Party, has just made a statement condemning this propaganda campaign. He warned against returning to the primitive anticommunism of the fifties and sixties.

CPSU, FRG Greens Hold 'Useful' Exchange

PM2809135389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Sep 89 Second Edition p4

[TASS report: "Seminar Ends"]

[Text] A bilateral seminar on the problems of nuclear energy, held in line with the program of cooperation agreed between the CPSU and the FRG Green Party, which includes cooperation in social and scientific directions, came to a close in Moscow on 22 September. Representatives of the Green Party were received by A.N. Yakovlev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politbureau and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

The following took part in the seminar on the Soviet side: Academician I.T. Frolov, member of the CPSU Central Committee; Academician B.N. Laskorin; Academician A.L. Yanshin; and writer S.P. Zalygin. On the West German side the following took part: R. Fuchs and J. Mayer [last name as published], members of the Green Party board; L. Wollny, deputy of the FRG Bundestag; and others.

They discussed ways to ensure the safe operation of various nuclear reactors, the prospects for developing other forms of energy, including those based on renewable energy sources, the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, and the storage and burial of nuclear waste.

During the seminar, different, sometimes opposite views were expressed on nuclear energy in the present and the future. At the same time, the sides felt it useful to be more thoroughly acquainted with one another's views on these questions and to exchange scientific and technical information contributing to the clarification of energy programs while taking into account the merits and shortcomings of different energy sources.

They stressed the role played by ecological movements in the discussion and resolution of energy matters, taking the attitude of the public and the population of different countries and regions into account.

A press conference was given by the seminar participants at the USSR Foreign Ministry press center the same day. Positively assessing its results, the speakers spoke in favor of continuing these meetings.

Italian President Receives Nishanov Delegation

LD2809214189 Moscow TASS in English 1907 GMT 28 Sep 89

[Text] Rome September 28 TASS—By TASS correspondents Aleksandr Tarakanov and Nikolay Teterin:

A delegation of the USSR Supreme Soviet was received by Francesco Cossiga, president of the Italian republic, in Rome today.

During conversation with the delegation, led by Chairman of the Council of Nationalities Rafik Nishanov, Cossiga said that the Italian people, government and he personally followed with much interest the profound reforms in the USSR, transformations in the political, social and economic spheres.

"We highly appreciate President Gorbachev's tremendous effort," he said.

Cossiga said the problems that arose in the course of perestroika, also in interethnic relations, are understood in Italy. The president said that the West as a whole, Western Europe and the North Atlantic Alliance, should in no case interfere in the Soviet Union's internal affairs, but should help it.

"The temptation to profit by these difficulties should be ruled out," Cossiga said.

"We realise why the nationalities question in the USSR is so acute now," Cossiga said. This should not be blamed on perestroika, he said. Nationalities problems would be even more explosive if not for restructuring. Cossiga believes Soviet society should be given time to sort out its problems.

In this context the president touched upon the problem of interethnic relations in Italy.

"We have profound admiration for your country, friendly feelings and sympathies for your people and we are looking forward to Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to Italy," Cossiga concluded.

In turn, Nishanov spoke about the work of the second session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, its chambers, committees and commissions. He spoke highly of the present state of and prospects for relations between the USSR and Italy in various areas.

A political dialogue has become much livelier of late. "We expect Italian parliamentarians to visit the Soviet Union and address the USSR Supreme Soviet," he said.

Nishanov pointed to large-scale tasks facing the two countries in the area of business cooperation and expressed satisfaction that they go beyond the traditional framework.

Both sides are striving to develop fundamentally new areas of interaction, such as combatting organised crime and illegal narcotics trafficking and natural calamities.

"We regard this as a manifestation of new thinking from the positions of which common human values should transcend the boundaries of states, regardless of their political and ideological orientation, and human suffering should be everybody's concern".

On Mikhail Gorbachev's behalf, Nishanov expressed best wishes to the head of the Italian state and asked him to convey them to the entire Italian people. He said Gorbachev had expressed hope that his forthcoming visit to Italy would promote the widening and consolidation of ties between the two countries and peoples.

Soviet Ambassador to Italy N. Lunkov participated in the meeting.

Latin America & Caribbean

Soviet-Cuban Relations, Shevardnadze Visit Viewed

PY2809223889 Moscow in Spanish to Latin America 230 GMT 27 Sep 89

[Text] It has been announced in Moscow that Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze will visit Havana after attending the 44th United Nations General Assembly and after paying a working visit to Nicaragua at the beginning of October.

Shevardnadze will meet Cuban officials, with whom he will exchange views over problems of mutual interest. Journalist Vladimit Korotkov filed this report:

For a long time now, meetings between Soviet and Cuban politicians and statesmen have been a tradition. In our fast-changing world, there are many problems that must be analyzed. This exchange of views has been provided for by the friendship and cooperation treaty that Mikhail Gorbachev and Fidel Castro signed in Havana 6 months ago.

One of the articles of this treaty directly says that for the sake of closer international cooperation, the USSR and Cuba will continue to exchange opinions on major problems.

The USSR and Cuba, as was said during the last meeting between Soviet and Cuban leaders in the spring of 1989, have adopted a common approach toward the main problems of the international community.

The two countries unanimously advocate stable peace, the elimination of nuclear threat, the unconditional right to self-determination, and the right to establish international economic relations on the basis of just foundations.

The USSR and Cuba have strongly supported the political settlement of all regional conflicts, including the situation in Central America, where there is now a real possibility of guaranteeing peace and security, while preserving the interests of all parties involved.

This objective calls for tolerance and civilized political behavior, as Shevardnadze put it at the United Nations yesterday.

In his speech, the Soviet foreign minister made an interesting comparison. The failure of Polish Communists in the elections was not hailed in the USSR. The USSR, however, is willing to actively cooperate with the new Polish coalition government, to which the USSR wishes success.

Shevardnadze wondered why other countries are so intransigent with respect to Cuba. If a non-Communist prime minister can be designated in a socialist country, why should the designation of a Communist head of state in a Western country be regarded as heresy?

We believe that this interpretation of the problem is quite fair.

Supreme Soviet Session

First Two Days of Supreme Soviet Session Viewed

PM2809125789 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 28 Sep 89 Morning Edition p 1

[Vyacheslav Shchepotkin report: "Two Days in September. First Impressions of the Start of the Work of the Second USSR Supreme Soviet Session"]

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted] Following M.S. Gorbachev's brief introductory speech and the approval of the agenda, the session at once began with reports on the state plan for the USSR's economic and social development for the coming year and on the country's budget.

I must point out that I have frequently attended seemingly similar functions, when a routine Supreme Soviet session has discussed a routine plan and routine budget allocations. But here the word "similar" should probably be placed within quotation marks. The point is precisely that nothing similar has happened before. People would be sitting in the hall, most of them totally indifferent as to what to vote for, for some believed in the infallibility of the leaders' understanding, others did not understand where various figures were taken from, and yet others realized that what they had to say, even if they said something from the rostrum, would probably have no effect on the figures drawn up somewhere in the silence of offices.

The figures in the present plan and budget probably were not drawn up in teeming public squares either. However, the breath of the teeming country and of the people tensely awaiting cardinal decisions from their deputies could be felt in the proposals advanced on the government's behalf by L.A. Voronin, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and V.S. Pavlov, the country's minister of finance. In both the state plan and the budget allocations there is a noticeable tendency, for example, toward increasing the economy's social orientation and the social thrust of expenditure. At the same time clear and unambiguous mention is made for the first time of the need to take extraordinary measures, and these measures are proposed right here. In particular, a reduction in spending on capital construction, on defense, on certain imported purchases, and so forth.

Yes, these figures were drawn up by specialists: by prominent economists, leaders of national economic sectors, and scientists. But the first 2 days of the session have shown that even people at first sight far removed from the economic and financial spheres can successfully understand them. Those who saw the television reports from the hall of the USSR Supreme Soviet chambers probably noticed not only the number of questions on the country's plan and budget but also their quality, if I may put it like this, which attests both to the deputies' level of interest and to their preparedness for resolving state tasks. I would call this probably one of the glaring features of the first 2 days of this latest session. The deputies showed that they can understand no worse than the government what worries the people.

Here, however, I could probably name another feature of these 2 September days: the ability of the government's representatives not only to present their position for discussion but also to uphold it. This was manifested particularly during the discussion of the draft Law on Amendments and Additions to the USSR Law on Cooperatives. L.I. Abalkin, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, spent some 45 minutes speaking on this and had to spend just as long answering questions. This is not surprising: Cooperatives have today become a field of extremely fierce conflicts and diametrically opposed opinions, ranging from total support to total rejection of them. This was manifested particularly during the debate on the proposed draft law. Its tone was set to a certain extent by USSR People's Deputies L.I. Sukhov, V.A. Yarin, V.V. Khmura, who called cooperatives "the people's cancerous tumor," and certain others. They spoke out sharply against cooperatives—some with reservations, some without—sometimes even eliciting applause of solidarity from the hall. In such an atmosphere, it seemed that considerable firmness would be required to defend the right to life of all forms of cooperatives and to oppose their being turned, according to the words of Deputy V.A. Popov, into "a tin can: opened-closed." However, the government's representative showed that he had that firmness. L.I. Abalkin argued methodically and insistently with the deputies, upholding the concept proposed by the government, although also agreeing that it could be improved. Remember the hot days of August, he said to the deputies, when the government was given approximately 4 weeks to draw up a whole number of drafts. It is quite possible that not everything was taken into account. However, he was unshakable on the chief point, that cooperatives must not be eliminated. Who knows, perhaps it was as a result of this insistence that the draft law was adopted on the first reading and referred for further discussion to the committees and commissions. This, in my view, is one more sign of something new that was manifested during the first 2 days of the session's work: The government and the deputies are learning to enter into a dialogue and seeking to proceed from confrontation to compromise and to do so profitably, although not yet always in parliamentary forms.

Finally, the chief sign of something new—the one mentioned by S.S. Alekseyev, chairman of the Committee for Questions of Legislation, Legality, and Law and Order. Unlike the previous session, here the discussion of draft laws began on the second day, and this, according to the deputy, inspires optimism.

Many questions were discussed during the first 2 days of the session's work. The proposed draft laws have been forwarded for further study to the USSR Supreme Soviet committees and commissions. And the result of their work will be shown over the next 2 days, when both chambers of the Soviet parliament will meet for a regular joint session. But these will be 2 days in October.

Work Plan for Supreme Soviet Agreed to 25 Sep

PM2809154589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 26 Sep 89 Morning Edition p 1

[Report by unnamed IZVESTIYA parliamentary correspondents: "The Second Session of the USSR Supreme Soviet Has Begun Its Work"]

[Excerpt] Moscow, Kremlin, 25 Sep—[Passage omitted] In accordance with the agenda A.I. Lukyanov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, was given the floor. He said that the parliamentarians had to examine approximately 60 draft laws and that it was extremely difficult to discuss them in 2 months, and so the Supreme Soviet Presidium had divided them into two packages. The first contains 19 urgent questions.

Work on the draft laws will mainly occur within the Supreme Soviet commissions and committees. The focus of the fall session's work should move there. USSR People's Deputies K.D. Lubenchenko, A.Z. Yastrebov, V.M. Desyatov, A.V. Gorbunov, I.B. Shamshev, and others voiced their proposals and put forward addenda to the agenda.

Summing up deputies' proposals and voicing his own considerations, comments, and objections to some of them, chairman M.S. Gorbachev put to the vote the question of ratifying the procedure for the work of the second session of the USSR Supreme Soviet in light of these proposals. The vote was carried out separately by chambers and produced the following results. In the Soviet of the Union 156 deputies voted "for," 49 "against, and 15 abstained. At the Soviet of Nationalities the figures were 157, 33, and 19 respectively. Thus, the session's procedure was determined.

The session will continue from 25 September through 24 November 1989. Joint and separate sessions of the chambers will be held every week—on Monday and Tuesday. The rest of the week is to be devoted to the work of committees and commissions. Draft laws and other questions are, as a rule, to be examined in the session in the order in which they are found on the session agenda.

Moreover, draft laws are usually to be discussed in the session with two readings. During the first, the question of the publication of the draft laws in the press is decided and the procedure determined for further work on them.

The morning plenary sitting continued after a short recess. M.S. Gorbachev announced that USSR People's Deputy V.I. Revnivtsev died 20 September. The deputies honored his memory with a minute's silence. [passage omitted]

PRAVDA Reports 26 Sep Proceedings

PM2909122589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Sep 89 Second Edition pp 1-2

[Unattributed report under the rubric "Second Session of USSR Supreme Soviet": "Reading of Draft Law Completed. PRAVDA Parliamentary Group Reports from Kremlin"]

[Text] Before the start of the morning sitting of the second day of the USSR Supreme Soviet session yesterday the main topic of conversation among the deputies were the drafts of the plan for the country's economic and social development in 1990 and next year's budget. Main priority is now being given to resolving social issues and increasing the output of consumer goods, food, housing, and cultural and consumer construction. Emergency measures are also being taken to improve the economy and finances.

The deputies, noting this, expressed different attitudes to the draft plan and budget, however. In the opinion of Hero of Socialist Labor V. Shubin, team leader and mentor at the Chita Machine Building Plant, the fulfillment of the planned measures should accelerate the overcoming of the economic and social difficulties being experienced by the country. A decisive condition for this is the introduction of new economic management methods, the enhancement of labor productivity, and the strengthening of production and technological discipline in each workers' collective.

Noting the reduction in the budget deficit to R60 billion in 1990 (in the current year it will be at R120 billion), People's Deputy Professor A. Denisov of the Leningrad Polytechnical Institute said that this is clearly inadequate, in his view. The budget could be balanced by using a certain amount of enterprise accumulations. After all, these are often unused. An enterprise may have tens of millions of rubles in its account but cannot use them. There are not enough machines or equipment to develop production. And the severe shortage of materials hampers the acceleration of housing construction. In this situation it would be more advantageous for the state to use enterprises' accumulations, on terms acceptable to the enterprises.

The deputies continued to comment on the agenda that has already been adopted for the session. In particular, the well-known Ukrainian writer B. Oleynik, deputy chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities, believes that a package of issues on nationalities problems and the ecological situation in the country should be included as a priority in the ten most important questions on the agenda. He is convinced that both these problems—nationalities and ecology—are interlinked and should be examined as such. If appropriate, B. Oleynik said, the question could be raised of the ecology of national relations and the extent to which they have now become tense, which is clear in connection with the economic blockade of Armenia.

...The third bell rang, and the next session sitting began. Yesterday the deputies heard a report from L. Abalkin, deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers, on the draft law on changes and additions to the law "On the Cooperative System in the USSR." This question is highly topical and concerns the interests of the entire people. The cooperative system is becoming a notable component in the national economy. However, there are many complications and difficulties involved in developing the cooperative movement.

Recalling his recent discussions with worker and peasant members of the CPSU Central Committee, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, chairing the session, noted that there is mounting righteous indignation among the people over the activities of trading, purchasing, and middleman cooperatives which produce virtually nothing but earn large incomes. This can hardly be called honest labor activity. And the justifiable demands to obstruct those who are illegally enriching themselves and discrediting the cooperative movement, without whose dynamic development the success of perestroyka cannot be ensured, are understandable.

S. Alekseyev, chairman of the Committee for Questions of Legislation, Legality, and Law and Order, who spoke in the debate, noted with satisfaction that the session is building up the pace of businesslike work. In his opinion, the government has submitted a good draft law for its examination. The main task, the deputy stressed, is to develop a civilized cooperative system. Not for nothing did V.I. Lenin call socialism a system of civilized cooperative members. S. Alekseyev noted with satisfaction that the proposed draft envisages an increase in the soviets' role in developing the cooperative network. All issues connected with cooperatives' activity will now be resolved by special commissions of deputies.

Needless to say, the proposed changes and additions to the Law on the Cooperative System were assessed in different ways by the deputies.

The statements by People's Deputy Academician A. Yemelyanov of the V.I. Lenin All-Union Academy of Agricultural Sciences merit attention. He believes that the changes to the Law on the Cooperative System should be aimed at eradicating the deformations in this area. In many cases the development of the cooperative system has not followed the necessary route. It sometimes causes social tension—particularly in the cities—rather than helping the population. Very many cooperatives engage in the repurchase and sale of goods at exorbitant prices while providing hardly anything for the economy or the people.

Hence the conclusion that at this stage there should be tougher state measures to regulate prices in cooperatives. There should be a kind of ceiling for such prices. At the same time, we need to also arrange state regulation of supplies to the cooperative system. After all, it is a fact that the system is currently in a worse position than state enterprises.

The cooperative system is indeed at the center of public opinion. Behind the scenes at the session we discussed this subject with many people's deputies. V. Murashov, team leader at the Lenin Collective Farm in the Udmurt Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic's Seltinskiy Rayon, believes that cooperatives are a promising way of developing the economy. But, he said, we need cooperatives which will really engage in producing foodstuffs and goods rather than just reselling them. And he cited the example of the "Rybovod" Cooperative, which produces six tonnes of fresh fish each year. There are more and more such cooperatives. In the deputy's opinion, the productive principle which the current clarifications will bring to the Law on the Cooperative System will help the new sector of the economy to slough off the "barnacles" clinging to it.

Doctor of Economic Sciences Professor A. Orlov, director of the Chelyabinsk branch of the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions' N.M. Shvernik Higher School of the Trade Union Movement, believes that if cooperatives earn an income disproportionate to the work they put in, they should be placed in economic conditions which will make such occurrences impossible in principle.

But the main thing, in the opinion of the people's deputy, is to make both sectors of the economy equal in both rights and responsibilities. It is impermissible when a veritable wave of cooperative closures has swept across the country without thorough investigation. The distortions in the movement cannot be eradicated by bans. But placing obstacles in the way of bureaucratic racketeering, as envisaged by the changes in the law, is another matter.

Another idea of A. Orlov's is interesting, in our view—the idea that trade inspectorates should also extend to cooperatives. For inspectorates to be effective they need to be switched to economic accountability. This will create a fundamentally new monitoring institution. At the same time, A. Orlov noted, we should not subject the cooperative system to wholesale criticism. We need a stable state policy with regard to cooperatives. Nothing in this area is as harmful as going from one extreme to the other. It is no secret that many cooperatives are now unwilling to invest in developing production because they fear that they could be closed down any day now and are channeling their profits into wages.

The deputies support the government's proposal to ban representatives of state organs from combining their work with membership of a cooperative.

At the end of the morning sitting there was a vote on the proposal to approve the draft law on changes and additions to the law "On the Cooperative System in the USSR" on its first reading, and, taking it as a basis, to submit it to the USSR Supreme Soviet standing commissions and committees for discussion.

An unusual clicking sound was then heard in the auditorium: The members of the USSR Supreme Soviet had been voting for the first time using the new electronic system. Within a few seconds the indicator board displayed the figures: 369 for, 70 against, 26 abstentions. Something funny happened, too: The chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet himself, who was watching the indicator board closely, forgot to press his own voting button. Incidentally, this was quickly discovered—another indisputable advantage of electronics—and, to slight animation in the auditorium, Mikhail Sergeyevich voted "for."

After the interval the USSR Supreme Soviet discussed a proposal from a group of deputies to end the activities of trading, purchasing, middleman, and certain other types of cooperatives as of 1 October this year, simultaneously establishing prices for cooperative goods and services that are no higher or just 10 percent higher than state prices. These proposals, too, were the subject of keen discussion. It was decided by a majority vote to submit them to the relevant commissions and committees for detailed analysis.

The USSR Supreme Soviet then continued its discussion of the draft resolution on the progressive taxation of the growth in funds used for paying wages in cooperatives. At the end of the sitting V. Pavlov, USSR minister of finance, answered deputies' questions.

Agenda Detailed, Cooperatives Law Discussed 26 Sep

PM2809162189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 27 Sep 89 Morning Edition p 1

[IZVESTIYA parliamentary correspondents A. Davydov and V. Dolganov report: "Moscow, The Kremlin: At the Second Session of the USSR Supreme Soviet"]

[Text] After a discussion the following agenda of the USSR Supreme Soviet's second session was adopted 25 September by separate votes in the chambers.

Priority Questions

1. On the State Plan for the Economic and Social Development of the USSR for 1990 and Progress in the Fulfillment of the Plan in 1989.

2. On the USSR State Budget for 1990 and the Implementation of the State Budget for 1988.

3. On the Draft Law on Amendments and Additions to the USSR Law "On the Cooperative System in the USSR."

4. On the Draft Law on Ownership in the USSR.

5. On the Draft Fundamentals of Land Legislation of the USSR and the Union Republics.

6. On the Draft Fundamentals of the Legislation of the USSR and the Union Republics on Leasing and Lease Relations in the USSR.

7. On the Draft Law on the Integrated Taxation System of the USSR.

8. On the Draft Law on the Socialist Enterprise.

9. On the Draft Law on the General Principles of the Leadership of the Economic and the Social Sphere in the Union Republics.

10. On the Draft Law on the General Principles of Local Self-Management and the Local Economy in the USSR.

11. On the Draft Law on Pension Provision.

12. On the Draft Law on the Procedure for Resolving Collective Labor Disputes (Conflicts).

13. On the Draft Law on Amendments and Additions to the USSR Constitution on Questions of the Electoral System.

14. On the Draft Standing Orders of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies and the USSR Supreme Soviet.

15. On the Draft Law on Constitutional Oversight in the USSR.

16. On the Draft Law on the Status of People's Deputies in the USSR.

17. On the Draft Law on the Transfer of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR], the Latvian SSR, and the Estonian SSR to Economic Autonomy.

18. On the Ratification of the Composition of the USSR Ministry of Defense.

19. Reports of the Commissions Formed by the Congress of USSR People's Deputies and the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Other Questions

20. Report by the USSR Foreign Minister on the Basic Guidelines of the USSR's Foreign Policy.

21. On the Draft Law on the Rights of Trade Unions in the USSR.

22. On the Draft Law on The Procedure for Recalling a USSR People's Deputy.

23. On the Draft Law on Ensuring the Activity of USSR People's Deputies and Compensating Them for the Expenses Involved in Their Deputy's Duties.

24. On the Draft Fundamentals of Legislation of the USSR and the Union Republics on Judicial Administration and the Law on Military Tribunals.

25. On the Draft Law on Responsibility for Contempt of Court.

26. On the Draft Law on Amendments and Additions to the USSR Law "On the Procedure on Appeal to the Court Against Unlawful Actions by Officials Which Infringe Citizens' Rights."

27. On the Draft Law on the Rights and Obligations of the Soviet Militia.

28. On Amnesty for Former Military Servicemen of the Limited Contingent of Soviet Forces in Afghanistan Who Were Captured by the Afghan Armed Opposition and Who Have Committed Criminal Offenses.

29. On the Draft Law on the Free Development and Equitable Use of the Languages of the Peoples of the USSR.

30. On the Draft Law on the Free National Development of Citizens of the USSR Living Beyond the Bounds of their National-State Formations or Who Do Not Possess Such Formations on the Territory of the USSR.

31. On the Draft Law on Amendments and Additions to the USSR Law "On USSR Citizenship."

32. On the Draft Law on the Press and Other Mass Media.

33. On the Draft Law on Young People and on State Youth Policy in the USSR.

34. On Urgent Measures for the Economic Improvement of the Country.

On 26 September the second session of the USSR Supreme Soviet continued work. Opening the morning session, M.S. Gorbachev proposed that deputies make use of knowledge gained the day before. It will be recalled that at the session's first sitting deputies learned how to work with an electronic information system and today they registered for the first time using a computer. So they pressed their buttons and the figure 483 appeared on the display screen.

The first item on the agenda is the examination of the draft law on the submission of amendments and additions to the USSR Law "On the Cooperative System in the USSR." L.I. Abalkin, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, who delivered the report, stressed that the question of cooperatives' activity cannot be examined in isolation without considering the situation and the general trends of economic development. Policy with regard to the cooperative movement fully meets the concept of restructuring for the liberation of the people's creative forces. The speaker noted that in implementing this policy the USSR Council of Ministers proceeds from the premise that first it is necessary to recognize the cooperative system as a fully fledged socialist form of economic management and to provide state and cooperative enterprises with equal conditions for their activity. In so doing it is very important to take local characteristics and national traditions into account.

L.I. Abalkin then cited statistics which demonstrate that the proportion of cooperatives' output in the country's national economy has grown sharply in recent years and that the cooperative movement now has a perceptible and ever increasing role in the population's provision with goods and services. The speaker stressed that cooperatives are taking the first serious steps toward forming a socialist market and that this sector's development has brought quite a few businesslike and truly talented people to the fore.

At the same time there has been an amount of criticism of cooperatives, and there have even been calls not to use their services at all. The government, the speaker said, believes that the assessment of the cooperative movement's activity must be based on the following. The positive and negative in the activity of the cooperative should not be lumped together. Where there is blatant speculation and flagrant violation of the law, resolute measures must be used. And conversely, where we see ventures that are beneficial to society they must be supported in every way. The draft law in question is entirely based on that precept. It envisages measures aimed at harmonizing the economic management conditions for the state and cooperative sectors of the economy and at the same time the need to step up state control of the growth in monetary incomes. In particular, it is proposed to give local soviets the right, if people's deputies or the public so demand, to take a decision on the closure of cooperatives if their activity is contrary to the law or society's interests.

Then the speaker answered deputies' questions.

The questions were often a repetition of those of concern to the public which are now being asked in a number of mass media organs. Why are cooperatives' prices sometimes inordinately inflated? Do local soviets have the right to close down cooperatives without sufficient grounds? How should mutual relations be formed between state and cooperative enterprises, how should price formation and taxation be regulated?...

S.S. Alekseyev, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Questions of Legislation, Legality, and Law and Order, noted: "The fact that from day one the session switched to the specific examination of laws is a good sign of our parliamentary life. At the same time it is especially important that an examination of problems connected with the cooperative system, which has become an object of social tension in society, is undertaken. In the opinion of committee head S.S. Alekseyev, the government has worked well and deputies have been given substantial material for further work. The committee approved this draft law on its first reading.

Deputies V.A. Shapovalenko, L.I. Sukhov, A.A. Sobchak, and others also took part in the discussion of the draft law.

The session is continuing its work.

Debate on Cooperative System Detailed

PM2809133489 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 27 Sep 89 p 1

[Own parliamentary correspondent L. Telen report: "From Drafts to Decisions"]

[Text] The Kremlin, 26 Sep—"Attention please, registration is now in progress!" M.S. Gorbachev, chairman of the morning sitting, said.

Figures flashed onto the electronic display board, announcing the start of the working day. It was also, incidentally, the first working day for the electronic system installed in the Kremlin sessions hall. Yesterday evening, after the necessary familiarization course, deputies finally found a common language with the electronics....

The second session of the Supreme Soviet is continuing its work, gradually progressing along its planned course. Reports have already been heard on the plan and budget for next year and the decision taken on the procedure for their discussion by the committees and commissions. The schedule is punishing and the atmosphere businesslike. And, if my first impressions do not mislead me, deputies clearly intend to implement many of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies decisions by adopting the maximum number of draft laws that will ease the country's economic situation.

First among them were additions to the Law "On the Cooperative System in the USSR"; a law on ownership; a land law; a law on the lease system and lease relations; a law on a unified taxation system; and a law on the socialist enterprise....

Academician L. Abalkin took the rostrum. Today, as deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, he submitted draft changes and additions to the Law "On the Cooperative System in the USSR."

Is there any need to prove that problems with the cooperative movement are becoming noticeably worse with every day? The powerful entrepreneurial wave has swept up hundreds of thousands of people, but they are unfortunately finding it difficult to keep afloat in the waters of our economy. Registration abuses, restrictions on credit, supply problems.... The list of obstacles standing in the way of honest cooperative members could easily be continued. But there is also another problem: shady operators and those who try to legalize their own business under the guise of being a cooperative. So now the "shashlik seller" in the greasy overall is becoming the symbol of the cooperatives in the mirror of public opinion.... In short, feelings are very heated, which has long made the cooperative question political rather than economic.

Yet while the arguments are showing no signs of dying down, the cooperatives are proving their viability in practice. The figures quoted by L. Abalkin at the session are convincing confirmation of this. Whether the opponents of the new movement like it or not, it is becoming—indeed, has already become!—a fact of economic life. The academician reminded deputies that the cooperatives have enlisted hundreds of keen, businesslike people under their standards. And it is the cooperatives that have to a certain extent undermined the state monopoly in the market.

The cooperatives, L. Abalkin said, addressing the deputies, are not a passing attempt to patch up the holes in the economy but a strategic course adopted by the government, a course that is to be taken seriously and that will be with us for a long time. That is why it is necessary to create equal conditions for all sectors of the economy right now. In this respect, the deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers stressed, we must take account of local features and national traditions and, for that reason, give republic and local soviets broader powers than they have now. These aims should be served by the additions to the law.

What was specifically proposed? To give soviets the right to decide priority areas and establish privileges for certain types of cooperatives. To introduce for cooperatives payment for labor resources. To give cooperatives the possibility to more actively set up associations, concerns, and consortiums, including those involving state enterprises. To change the procedure of supply and also the procedure for entering the foreign market....

So, the government proposals have been published. Now the parliamentary commissions and committees have to weigh them up and analyze them and submit their assessment of the draft.

At the evening sitting of the Supreme Soviet it is planned to discuss the question of an amnesty for former military servicemen of the limited Soviet troop contingent in Afghanistan who committed crimes and were taken prisoner by the Afghan armed opposition.

Tomorrow the deputies will continue work in the commissions and committees.

Supreme Soviet Committees, Commissions Meet 28 Sep

LD2809190189

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1500 GMT on 28 September carries a 37-minute roundup by commentator Lyudmilla Semina on the work of the committees and commissions of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Semina says that coverage of the work of all the committees and commissions is difficult because they are spread around different locations. Therefore, Mayak has decided to conduct some interviews and to play a few recordings of remarks made at committee and commission sittings so that listeners receive some flavor of what has been happening.

The Commission on Planning, Budget and Finance today discussed the draft budget and plan for next year. Panskov, USSR first deputy minister of finance, addressed the meeting. Panskov says that the specific economic situation predetermined the form of the draft economic plan and budget for 1990. The main emphasis in the draft budget is to muster resources and cut the budget deficit of the country. However, spending in the social sphere is to increase. Enterprises will be given more of an incentive to make profits.

Correspondent Marina Novitskaya reports from the Committee on the operation of Soviets of People's Deputies, Development of Administration, and Self-Government. Mikhail Mikhaylovich Prusak, a sovkhoz director from Novgorod oblast, says in an interview that the issue of the budget is a most important one: If any mistake is made, 1990 will be most difficult. Prusak says that old methods of economic administration from the center are still prevailing. It would be better to place budget resources in the hands of local bodies of administration. Novitskaya asks Prusak's opinion on the issue of whether sovkhoz directors should continue to decide issues relating to leasing land. Prusak says that he agrees with the view that local soviets should make decisions on lease contracting.

Correspondent Olga Vasilenko reports from the Commission for Social and Economic Development of Constituent and Autonomous Regions and Territories. Commission Chairman Eduardas Yonovich Vilkas gave an interview. Vilkas says that all the republics have an important role to play in the social and economic development of the country. Vilkas advocates the principle of regional financial autonomy, seeing this as the way to get the Soviet national economy moving. Vilkas says that the central government has been slow to give financial autonomy to the republics, and that this explains the slowness of the economic reforms under perestroyka.

Vladimir Dmitriyevich Yudin, a member of the commission for industry, energy, equipment, and technology tells a radio correspondent about the tasks of the committees and commissions. Yudin says that the procedure for passing decisions at the Supreme Soviet session is an important matter. It is vital that issues should be discussed in the committees and commissions before any voting takes place at the full Supreme Soviet session.

Many deputies were present today at an enlarged plenary session of the Committee on Legislation, Legality, Law and Order which engaged in preliminary discussion of a future press law. Nikolay Vasiliyevich Fedorov, a lawyer and committee member, tells the correspondent that the committee made some progress today in discussing matters connected with providing more freedom of speech. The presence of representatives of other committees and commissions at the sitting today should ensure proper discussion of this issue at the full Supreme Soviet session. The majority of deputies are well disposed to the press law which is being drafted, and this augurs well.

Chingiz Aytmatov, chairman of the Commission on Matters of Development of Culture, Language, National and International Traditions and the Protection of Historical Heritage, spoke at a commission session today. Sergey Gavrilovich Shuvalov, a commission member, spoke about the draft budget for 1990. Shuvalov condemned the fact that culture is still being funded according to the residual principle. Wages of people working in culture are much lower then the average for all working people of the country. Shuvalov says that cuts in expenditure on culture are unacceptable. The tasks of cultural development must be tackled in goal-oriented plans geared toward end results.

Semina introduces a recording of an interview with Vladimir Belyayev, head of the subcommittee for public education. Belyayev advocates a change in approach so as to give greater priority to financing education programs.

Semina says that on 29 September the committees and commissions will continue their work, and that we will see the results of their work on 2 October at the joint sitting of the chambers of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Deputies Debate Draft Budget, Land Law

LD2809191489 Moscow TASS in English 1850 GMT 28 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow September 28 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent:

Will the USSR state budget for 1990, proposed by the government to parliament, help halt and reverse the negative trends in the Soviet economy? This question was the focus of attention at the Soviet parliament today.

Taking part in the debate were members of the planning, budget and financial commission of the chamber of the union, as well as representatives of other permanent bodies of the USSR Supreme Soviet, dealing with economic issues.

Vladimir Panskov, first deputy finance minister, set out the main proportions of the draft budget. Having stressed that this document reflects the state of the Soviet economy, he said that one of the main tasks in preparing the draft was to cut the budget deficit.

Panskov noted that in early 1989 the deficit ran to 120.8 billion roubles and was expected to come down to 92 billion by the end of the year.

Reducing state expenditure offers a real way of cutting the deficit. The deputy finance minister said that cuts in capital investment and defence spending helped save 28.4 billion roubles. The budget will receive another 3 billion roubles after a 130 per cent increase in prices of diesel fuel. This figure takes into account compensation for major consumers of the fuel.

Panskov spent more than two hours answering deputies' questions. His replies, backed up with figures, however failed to convince many members of parliament.

Aleksandr Orlov (Urals) believes that the draft budget was risky. It has no guarantees that all investment into the social sphere will be absorbed in full. The deputy was also concerned over huge subsidies, amounting to 100 billion roubles, for covering the difference in price of agricultural products. Orlov urged more attention to be paid to making effective use of investments into the agro-industrial complex rather than to increasing subsidies.

"The government-proposed draft budget largely meets the demands of the congress of people's deputies," Viktor Kucherenko, chairman of the Planning, Budget and Financial Commission, told TASS. "However certain positions of the document need to be radically revised. We should be convinced that the plan and budget for 1990 could be fulfilled."

Keen discussion broke out at the parliamentary committee on economic reform where deputies began discussion of the draft law on land. It was stressed at the meeting that the law on land is closely linked to the law on property in the USSR.

The deputies started their work today by discussing if the law on land met the requirements of the new stage of economic reform.

Prominent economist Vladimir Tikhonov sharply criticised the draft law prepared by the government. The deputy stressed that it was necessary to address the main issue: whether consistent steps should be taken towards land reform or whether new notions should be adapted to old norms.

The need to revise this draft law was raised on many occasions during the discussion. A view was also expressed that an alternative variant of the fundamentals of the law on land should be prepared.

Republican, All-Union Ties Discussed

LD2809175589 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 28 Sep 89

[Report from the USSR Supreme Soviet by correspondent Olga Vasilenko]

[Text] Today, the work of the committees of the Supreme Soviet and the commissions of its chambers is continuing not just in the Kremlin, but also in the Hotel Moskva, in the House of the Russian Federation Soviets, at no 4 Kalinin Avenue, and in a building which used to belong to the standing commissions of the Supreme Soviet. It is precisely here that your correspondent is situated from where I am presenting this account. It is here that the majority of committees and commissions meet. Everywhere I have seen and heard that the most trenchant debates are continuing on the drafts of the plan and budget.

Well, I will talk now of the work of the Commission for Social and Economic Development of Constituent and Autonomous Regions and Territories. Here, the plan of every union republic and its correspondence with our general plan is analyzed. The fact of the matter is that the program contains an extremely limited set of indices and tasks. And for those who are already going over to financial autonomy, for the Baltic republics, for example, only deliveries to the general republican fund and to interrepublican flows are determined. The republics themselves plan all the rest. This is for the first time. Deputies have also spoken of how these links can be strengthened and with whom should they be arranged: directly with the enterprises or via the gosplan or Council of Ministers of the republics. In this case, it is a question of intraunion integration. However, it transpires that financial autonomy is needed everywhere. Then there will be success. And the government of the Union, as deputy Vilkas, chairman of the commission, said is not yet ready to solve that question.

I shall add that apart from the concern of their own republics, deputies are speaking of our general concerns, of the earthquake in Armenia, of Chernobyl. And I would very much like to note the desire of deputies not to counterpose the interests of their own region to others but to adopt such decisions that are of benefit to all—both the republic and the union. And there is no hurrying here at all. Therefore, a great deal of work still lies ahead for the deputies in this commission. And later, we will acquaint you with its results, of course. And on that, I will end my account of the activities of the committees and commissions of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Political & Social

Gorbachev Speaks at 28 Sep Ukrainian Plenum

LD2809181589 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 28 Sep 89

[Report on Ukraine Communist Party Central Committee plenum in Kiev on 28 September, with introductory and closing speeches by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, and remarks by Vladimir Ivashko—recorded]

[Text] [Presenter] Today there was a plenum of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee. We are switching to Kiev. Our special correspondent Aleksandr Ruvinskiy reports:

[Ruvinskiy] In the republic, great significance is attached to this plenum. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, who arrived today in Kiev, participated in it. Apart from Central Committee members and candidate members and members of the Auditing Commission, many republican leaders participated in the work of the plenum, and, perhaps for the first time at such a plenum, media representatives also took part, including your special correspondent as well. Vladimir Vasiliyevich Shcherbitskiy, opening the plenum, made a statement to its participants and the Ukranian Communist Party Central Committee. He asked to be released from the post of first secretary of the Central Committee of the republic's Communist Party, in connection with his age and state of health. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev addressed those assembled:

[Begin recording] [Gorbachev] Today, at the plenum of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee, an organizational issue is being studied, and allow me, within the framework of the affirmed agenda, to report several proposals to you. These will be proposals from the CPSU Central Committee and the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee Politburo. I will say that these are also the considerations of the first secretaries, with whom there was a meeting on the eve of this plenum.

First of all, I would like to initiate you, well, perhaps, into how this issue was formed, how it arose, and when, and how we approached solving it. I mean the issue of the change in leadership—the first secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee. This is an important issue, a large issue, of general party significance by virtue of the role which the Ukraine plays in the destinies of the country—and the Ukrainian Communist Party, too.

Vladimir Vasiliyevich Shcherbitskiy applied somewhat earlier to be released from the responsibilities of a member of the Politburo and the first secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee well, more exactly, during my previous trip to you in the Ukraine. I think it was in March.

This is in connection with age and with a worsening of his state of health, about which he was now told you in his statement, address. At that time, when the report and election campaign was in full flow and we stood on the eve of great events, we in the Politburo conferred and resolved—and agreed with Comrade Shcherbitskiy—to return to this issue immediately after the conclusion of these major political campaigns in the country.

In connection with this, Comrade Shcherbitskiy's appeal to release him from the responsibilities of a member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, for those reasons which he said today, was also studied at the September plenum of the Party Central Committee. In his appeal to the Central Committee of the Party, Comrade Shcherbitskiy requested the permission of the CPSU Central Committee to put the question of releasing him from the responsibilities of first secretary as well.

You know the decision of the party Central Committee on this account. And I now want to say on behalf of the Central Committee and Politburo, to support, to ask you to support the request of Comrade Shcherbitskiy to release him from the responsibility of first secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party.

This is a large, serious and important event, both in the life of the party and in the life of Comrade Shcherbitskiy. He is a well- known person in the party. He has a great life behind him. His political and practical activity at various posts, including as a member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee undoubtedly deserves positive assessments. At the CPSU Central Committee plenum, warm words of gratitude were uttered to Comrade Shcherbitskiy for his longstanding, fruitful activity for the good of the party and country, and I hope that you, members of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee share this assessment of the CPSU Central Committee. [applause]

Allow me, Vladimir Vasiliyevich, to heartily thank you once more for your longstanding, intense labor in the name and interests of the party, the people and socialism, for your great contribution to the development of the republic, to wish you kind health and prosperity. [applause]

This is the first part of my report. And allow me immediately to give some thoughts on the new first secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee.

At the Central Committee Politburo—your Central Committee—we agreed that I would touch on this topic in general terms, while other comrades would—on behalf of the Central Committee Commission for Organizational Party matters and Cadre Policy [as heard]—report on the outcome of the discussion and the drafting of the proposals. I would like to say straight off, comrades, that we resolved to examine this big question, as I have already said, for the entire party, and naturally for your party organization—together with the republic's communists and working people. We resolved to examine this question in an open atmosphere and make the correct choice. After the CPSU Central Committee Plenum, I met all the members of the Central Committee from the Ukraine as well as members of its Auditing Commission and candidate members. I asked all the comrades to think things over, to take advice from the oblast party organizations, to invite the aktiv or secretaries—or whomever they deemed necessary—to speak to the working people, and to formulate an opinion. I believe we did the right thing. Above all, we showed respect for, and confidence in one of our largest party organization—the Communist Party of the Ukraine—as well as confidence in the communists and working people of the Ukraine. I believe this is not only in accordance with the role which is played by the Ukrainian Party organization and the republic: The responsibility of the Communist Party of the Ukraine and the working people of the Ukraine is great for all that we must tackle in the coming years. Without successful work and without these tasks being resolved successfully within the framework of the policy of perestroyka, we are unable to hope for the success of perestroyka in the country—if these tasks are not successfully resolved in the Ukraine. That's the size of it; that's the scale of it; that's the role for the Ukraine. We were also working on the basis of another premise: Given the openness and democracy that have encompassed both society and the party, there is no other way to set about drafting our proposals for the post of first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Ukraine.

The comrades will give a detailed report later, as I have said. But generally speaking, the outcome is taking shape. Comrade Vladimir Antonovich Ivashko should be recommended for the post of first secretary of the

Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Ukraine. Several other names were put forward, but when all was said and done—even where other names were mentioned—all the oblast party organizations finally came round to the unanimous opinion. You probably know Vladimir Antonovich Ivashko, but nevertheless, the situation calls for you to be given some information about his work and some biographical information. He was born in 1932 in Poltava. He is a Ukrainian. He has been a member of the CPSU since 1962. His life and work have been bound up with the Ukraine. He has considerable teaching and research experience. He is a candidate of economic sciences. He has performed party work: He headed a department and has been a secretary on the Kharkov oblast party committee; a secretary on the Communist Party of the Ukraine Central Committee; first secretary of the Dnepropetrovsk oblast party committee; and since 1988 he has been second secretary of the Communist Party of the Ukraine Central Committee. He is a member of the CPSU Central Committee and a USSR people's deputy.

In conversations and discussions on this, comrades noted the high organizational qualities and the firm ideological position of Comrade Ivashko. Comrades noted his capacity for work and his ability to build relations with people and to unite them. Confidence was expressed everywhere that, in the present sociopolitical and economic situation in the Ukraine, he will be able to head the Communist Party of the Ukraine Central Committee Politburo and guarantee the active progress of perestroyka.

If you agree with this proposal, inasmuch as it is the opinion of the Ukrainian communists themselves, then it would be possible at the plenum, first of all, to name a decision on the release of Comrade Vladimir Vasiliyevich Shcherbitskiy from the post of first secretary of the Communist Party of the Ukraine Central Committee, and second, to examine the recommendation for the post of first secretary of the Communist Party of the Ukraine Central Committee, which the CPSU Central Committee also supports. [end recording]

[Ruvinskiy] Comrade Kharchenko, the chairman of the Committee for Organizational-Party and Cadre Work, told the plenum how the discussion of that question took place in the party organizations of the republic. In all, at the meetings of the party aktiv, during that address, around 200 people spoke, and on the whole, the candidacy of Comrade Ivashko was supported. However, other candidacies were also put forward. At the very beginning of the discussion of the candidacies at the plenum, the proposal was made to carry out elections on an alternative basis. However, many members of the Communist Party Central Committee opposed this. The following opinion was also given. I quote: That alternative and secret ballot may knock us off course. Many of those who spoke, evaluating the role of Vladimir Vasiliyevich Shcherbitskiy in the leadership of the republican party organization spoke of the successes of perestroyka and proposed that these successes be consolidated. Criticism was pronounced of the Interregional Deputy Group. A considerable number of the candidates who were put foward withdraw their candidacy from the voting. In the ballot for secret voting were the candidacy of Comrade Ivashko, second secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the republic and of Comrade Gurenko secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, who up until recently worked as first secretary of the Crimean obkom of the Communist Party of the Ukraine. Here are the results of the secret ballot. For Comrade Gurenko, there were 43 votes. For Comrade Ivashko—136. Thus, Comrade Ivashko has been elected first secretary of the Communist Party of the Ukraine Central Committee.

The results of the elections were approved by the plenum. After that Vladimir Vasilyevich Shcherbitskiy asked for the floor. He expressed satisfaction with the plenum and its decisions and gave thanks for the warm words addressed to him.

The plenum was addressed by Comrade Ivashko:

[Begin recording] [Ivashko] Comrades, I am profoundly aware of what a responsibility being at the head of our republican party organization is, even more so now in the period of the fundamental restructuring of all spheres of our society's life. I am aware of this, and that is why I place my main hopes on the support, comradely assistance, and mutual understanding on the part of the Politburo, of the members of the Central Committee of the republic's Communist Party, of local party committees and primary party organizations and all communists. Only collective reason, selfless work, and Bolshevist adherence to principle will help cope with those difficult tasks which we are facing today.

The main thing now—for all of us in the period of preparations for the 28th CPSU Congress—is to ensure a sharp turn in the activities of party organizations and to strengthen their authority with real concrete deeds. We need to further deepen the democratization of innerparty life and raise each communist's personal responsibility for perestroyka, for its results, for the state of affairs in each collective, and for the destinies of the party and the country.

Our duty—personally I consider this to be a most important duty—is to strengthen the ideological and organizational unity of the party ranks, remembering that disorder and vacillation at revolutionary stages of history are fatal for the party.

Now, as never before, it is impermissible to lose the political initiative and to go with the stream. After all, as Vladimir Ilyich warned: Whoever voluntarily concedes influence in politics deserves, in quotation marks, to have not only his influence taken away, but also the right to exist. In my view we must bear this very clearly in mind now. Work with cadres is the main lever of influence of party oganizations—and here I am asking for assistance both from you all and from all communists of the republic—on the state of affairs today—for all the complications we now have. We simply don't have the right to give it up to anyone.

While continuing to democratize consistently the selection and assignment of cadres, we need to focus attention on studying people. We need to organize work in such a way that the candidates for promotion should always be in the public eye and should be tested in practice. It is such a line which we now need to implement in the course of reportback and election campaign in primary party organizations.

While preparing for the upcoming elections of people's deputies of the Ukraine and of deputies to local soviets, we are obliged to approach responsibly the drawing up of a election platform for the Communist Party of the Ukraine. I think we should do this collectively. We should look at it in all party organizations and go to the people with a clear line of our Communist Party of the Ukraine on all aspects of the life of our 52 million-strong republic. It is necessary to reflect on our party positions for all key questions of the socioeconomic and intellectual development of the Ukraine.

I understand well—and you will probably agree with this—that the pace of renewal in various spheres of the republic's life is obviously insufficient. People are dissatisfied with a great many things. We first of all need urgent measures to improve the state of affairs in the socioeconomic sphere and to achieve tangible changes for the better in raising the real well-being of all categories of the population.

Here the key area consists of working out and implementing in practice the principles of the economic independence of the Ukraine within the single national economic complex of the country, of seeking to achieve everywhere the introduction of financial autonomy, and of new economic relations. This is our party concern and in my view no one will replace us in this. We must give paramount attention to the solution of the housing and the food problem, to satisfying the market with essential goods, to a cardinal improvement in health care—this is a very weak area of ours—and in consumer services to the population. We must do everything possible to speed up the resolution of environmental protection tasks that have come to a head and to break the tendency toward a worsening of the ecological situation in the republic. Our particular concern and source of pain is Chernobyl—and it is quite clear that urgent measures and the united efforts of both republican and union bodies are needed here. After all, it is a matter of the health and destiny of our people. There are many people who even now are still under the tangible influence of this very serious catastrophe. The situation in other regions of our country which is only slowly changing also worries people. I will single out the problem, for example, of the Crimean atomic power station, which, I would say, hangs like the Sword of Damocles both over the social situation in the republic and over the mood of people, and if you will, I am deeply convinced...[changes thought] nevertheless it will not be...[changes thought again] but it is simply necessary to resolve this matter. A very great deal needs to be done. In order to resolve all these problems, it is necessary to strengthen organization, discipline and law and order everywhere. If we do not get rid of lax practices, lack of discipline and lack of responsibility on all levels, then we will simply ruin perestroyka. Neither the people nor history will forgive us this. We are called on to continue consistently to bring about political reform and to support the social and political activeness of the masses. Our strength is in people alone. It goes without saying that the processes of perestroyka are proceeding most dynamically in the intellectual sphere. Glasnost is being extended. Ethnic self-awareness is developing. Interest in the historical past is growing. We are obliged to direct these processes into a creative channel, and to do everything possible in order to ensure the flowering of Ukrainian culture and the satisfaction of the national-cultural requirements of representatives of all the nations which are living in the republic. Being governed by the decisions of the September plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, we must persistently seek to achieve a harmonization of interethnic relations and in no degree, by a careless word or act, facilitate some sort of confrontation arising in our republic on an ethnic basis. We have the strength to do this. Today it is becoming more and more evident that if we are intending to move forward successfully, we must raise the efficiency of all the intellectual potential in the republic. The achievement of this aim is only possible on the path of cardinal changes in the system of upbringing and education of the rising generation and in the restructuring of the organization of all our science and culture. Comrades, in all areas of work, very difficult tasks lie before us, before the Communist Party of the Ukraine Central Committee, and the entire republican party organization. I am certain that we will cope if we close ranks and unite the efforts of communists and of all working people in order to achieve the real results of perestroyka, the raising of the material and cultural standard of living of our people. I, with your help and with your support, shall try to give all my strength to this. Once again my deep gratitude to you for the confidence you have shown in me. Thank you [applause] [end recording]

[Presenter] I have to say that while this news bulletin was going on, my colleague Igor Zorin, recorded a conversation with Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Comrade Ivashko, first secretary of the Communist Party of the Ukraine Central Committee.

We are proposing to broadcast it today at 2200 on the first program. At the plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Ukraine, at the end of it, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev spoke again:

[Begin recording] [Gorbachev] Dear comrades, first of all, I would like to express deep satisfaction in the name of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in connection with the results of this plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist

Party of the Ukraine. I think, even if I do not go into a detailed analysis, that it is worth noting that this plenum with all its work and the decisions that have been made, demonstrates the huge potential which is contained in it and which is contained in the party ranks of the Communist Party of the Ukraine. This increases even more my certainty that shoulder to shoulder with Ukrainian communists, the working people of the Ukraine are up to the task of resolving those huge tasks that have arisen before us at this critical stage of perestroyka. I wish you great success. I congratulate you on the results of the plenum, on making, in my opinion, responsible decisions, which were due to a careful, democratic process. I congratulate Comrade Vladimir Antonovich Ivashko on his election to the post of first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Ukraine. [applause]

I want to say once again that the Ukraine is one of the largest Union republics. It has large relative importance in the country. Major detachments of the working class, of the peasantry, and of the intelligentsia are concentrated here. There is a great deal of science here, major machine-building. On how things proceed further in the republic—the results and the very progress of perestroyka in our country will depend on this too.

All this, in fact, determines both the role and the measure of responsibility of the republic's communists for matters and the situation in the Ukraine, for the further development of the republic, and, in general, for the destiny of perestroyka. We recently discussed all these questions from principled standpoints at the September plenum of our party's Central Committee, which has just taken place. The results of the Central Committee's September plenum, as one was able to realize already during the days that have passed since the conclusion of its work, are being discussed in an animated and very committed fashion in the party, in the country and—to speak plainly—throughout the world, comrades. Despite all the variety of opinions and assessments expressed—which is certainly the case—there is, nevertheless, a widespread public view and a common recognition of the exceptional nature and the importance of its decisions, both as regards bringing forward the time at which the next, the 28th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union will be held, and as regards the party's new nationalities policy.

At the Central Committee's September plenum, it proved possible, through collective efforts, to take a new step forward in comprehending—it's a difficult matter, but a necessary AND essential one—the dialectics of the revolutionary transformations begun by the party. In the context of the processes of perestroyka, there was a big conversation at the plenum about renewing the CPSU. This question worries many people, not just communists. It worries our entire society. Various, often diametrically opposed views on the subject are being voiced. Specifically, an opposition is being persistently depicted by some forces between party and state, and between party and people. The idea is being tossed in our direction that the party should be completely divorced from political leadership and removed from state affairs—and virtually from all public affairs. One even encounters arguments to the effect that the decisions and resolutions of party bodies, including even the Central Committee and the Congress, may only be of a purely intraparty nature and ought to have no effect whatsoever on the life of the country and society. This is the most extreme version of the distinction that is drawn between the party and party policy, and everything that is happening in the country.

Usually the following arguments are adduced: The Party is allegedly unable today to take on itself the responsibility for the country and for its future, because the burden of past mistakes hang over it. Of course, there were mistakes and the Party is answering for them; no one is expunging them. But we don't have the right to express such an appraisal. This would be a distortion of another kind, which would be no less serious. It cancels all these decades of struggle for socialism, for the cause of the working people. Most importantly, it is precisely the CPSU which took on itself the initiative for the April turn, proposed a fundamentally new policy and headed perestroyka. In this way it is demonstrating political maturity and might, and a high degree of responsibility to the people for the fate of the country.

Everyone still remembers the policies which were pursued for many years, when a multitude of very complicated problems of social development accumulated and piled up, one on top of the other. It was not easy to step across these barriers—you know this and you can, perhaps, understand this better than others. But we have done that. The Party's task was to make a diagnosis in time, to occupy itself with curing the disease which has deeply affected our society. That is why the Party told the people the truth about the situation which had arisen and proposed policies whose realization will make it possible to take the country out of the crisis situation in which it found itself. This is an immense and extremely complicated task. We, all of us, understand this especially well now. Many probably feel as if tension in society is physically building up, summer lightnings are flashing, and discharges of thunder are rumbling.

I think that in these conditions, especially necessary is reason and political will which can be guaranteed by such an organization as the Party—together, of course, with local soviets, public organizations, public movements, together with everyone who hold dear the destiny of perestroyka and the interests of people. There can be no other approach today. We all strongly feel the correctness of Lenin's words regarding the impermissible luxury of convoluted discussions at the busiest time when all forces need to be pooled and channelled into action.

The situation we face is this: Either we go forward on the basis of the newly acquired democratic experience toward normal, efficiently functioning political and economic structures, or else we will be thrown back towards the old ways. A return to the past must not be permitted, just as the manifestation of extremism and the artificial rocking of our ship of state are also impermissible. We say this firmly, because the Party has been, and remains, the main organizing and coordinating force capable of leading the people along the path of profound socialist renewal, playing an integrating and consolidating role in society and, let us be blunt, preventing an undesriable and dramatic development of events. Perestroyka will not work without the party and its fundamental influence on all aspects of social life.

At the CPSU Central Committee conference in July this year, and at the September plenum of the Party Central Committee, there was a detailed and critical discussion of the main aspects of the Party's activities, its interrelationship with the soviets and other levels of the political system, and the concept of ideological work and internal party life. Party organizations received restructuring landmarks that corresond to the times. This adds to their confidence and promotes a stepping up of progress of perestroyka.

Today at the plenum of the Communist Party of Ukraine Central Committee, I want once again to stress that in a renewed society only a renewed party which has resolutely renounced what was distoring and deforming its Leninist visage and democratic methods of work can realistically, can influence the course of events. The time has come, when for every communist mere waiting, the avoidance of an active social stance, and pessimistic and defeatist attitudes are no longer permissible. Confusion is the destiny of the weak. The real revolutionary, Vladimir Ilyich Lenin stressed, is only he who is able to act in a revolutionary way in the most complex conditions and not he who joins in the revolution when it is on the upsurge.

In speaking about the party I should like to highlight certain matters. First, events of late have particularly vividly shown the need for the Party afresh, and at the top of its voice, to speak of itself as a Party which has adopted a course of the profound renewal of socialism and as a party of the working class and the defender of the interests of the entire people. I think that the attempts of particular theoreticians, in quotation marks, groups and movements to drive a wedge between workers and the CPSU will not have remained unnoticed by you. There are forces which do not conceal their antisocialist orientation. In their striving to force their way to power they are seeking support from the working class. They are striving to appear as zealous expressers and defenders of its interests in counterbalance to the Party, and raise the question of the latter's self-elimination. There are bearers of such ideas among you here in the Ukraine too. Appeals are also being made to the working class by those who are more and more openly expressing their dissatisfaction with the very fact of Party renewal, its renunciation of certain former functions, and most of all with the fact that it has placed itself under open supervision by the people, has set democracy loose, as they put it, and, it seems, is losing its own vanguard role. Some are even saying this. There are attempts to create the impression that Perestroyka is founded upon deviation from the bases of Marxist-Leninist thought and is therefore plunging the country into chaos. This is all slander against the Party. If someone imagines that it is possible to master the situation by using the former strong-arm methods, then that, comrades, is a dangerous delusion.

The CPSU has proposed and is implementing a policy that meets the interests and aspirations of the people, and will uphold that policy, intensifying and adjusting it with due consideration for reality. It will also continue to rely on support from the working class, the peasantry and the intelligentsia, and to express the ideology of socialist choice. This is the CPSU's principled and strategic course.

Second, I would like to go on to stress party building as likewise a key issue. We are in favor of a Union state, of a federation of peoples, and all of us together are in favor of the unity of the Party that is acting as a major factor in the consolidation of society. The Party incorporates representatives of all social groups and all nationalities. In the country today there are no forces as capable as the CPSU of integrating so widely the objectives of different republics and autonomous territories, of eliminating misunderstandings and disagreements, of articulating common interests, and of vigorously conducting the quest for a nationwide consensus.

Third, I would like to dwell on the following issue. Perestroyka in the work of the Party bodies and their apparatus involves, as an essential element, the cultivation of a permanent and fruitful dialogue with public organizations and self-organized movements. Today this is one of the necessary conditions for intensifying the processes of renewal, for expanding the social base of perestroyka, and, if I may put it this way, for the Party to earn authority as the originator and political guarantor of a stable civil peace in the country. Many Party workers are troubled by the idea of cooperating with newly-arisen social forces; they are troubled, most likely, because some of those forces are not concealing their destructive and ambitious aspirations. Yet one also has to take into account the fact that alongside the views that are unacceptable for us in the aims and activities of various public organizations, there is a must that should be supported and incorporated into the general flow of perestroyka. One must take a definite position on these matters, comrades. Either we recognize the right of others to independent thought and action and conduct vigorous work to win public opinion and public sympathies over to our side—in other words multiply the driving forces behind perestroyka—or else we shall turn into an exclusive organization with claims to a leading role. Political dialogue is not only a means of reaffirming, in conditions of political democracy, the justification for our leading position, but also a reliable means of acquiring assistants and allies in such an environment. A rapid process of realization by trade unions, the Komsomol and other public organizations of their new role—above all in labor collectives—is now underway in the country. The CPSU does not only welcome this, but will further it in every way.

Fourth, on the assimilation of new forms and methods of Party influence on the development of the economy and the social sphere. What is our starting point here? It consists in the fact that the Party has not, nor is, evading responsibility for the solving of problems in this area. Where principles are concerned, the line is a clear one: The CPSU conducts its political course through communists working in the bodies of power, in production and so on. In order to fulfil this role party committees must take up a clear-cut position on the strategy for socioeconomic development, whether of the republic, oblast, rayon or labor collective, discuss them on a broad democratic basis, weigh up the possible options and propose the optimal solution. A favorable atmosphere is evolving for such work. The adoption by the USSR Supreme Soviet of new laws on property, on leasing and leasehold relations, on land, on a common taxation system and a number of others will make it possible to continue the economic transformations to greater effect and to put into practice the tremendous potential contained in socialist production relations.

It is also essential to change approaches in practical work. Many have slackened the fight and concrete work to implement measures concerning the acceleration of scientific and technical progress, the renewal of equipment, the improvement of the quality, durability and reliability of items, the reduction of labor, energy and materials consumed per unit of output, the application of the strictest regime of technological discipline, economy and thrift. In short, they are paying less attention to labor productivity growth and production efficiency improvements. This must be put right. Without such measures it will be difficult, or to be more precise, impossible, to get out of the grave financial situation and overcome the crisis phenomena in the economy. I see the solution in the consistent and persistent implementation of the economic reform on all its parameters with the simultaneous adoption of tough measures to improve our financial health.

Fifth, the present stage of society's development requires maximum exertion of the Party's efforts, of those of every one of its organizations. Major significance is being acquired by practical work and supervision of fulfilment of the decisions we are adopting. Nothing causes such tangible damage to the cause as a stance pending, and loose organizational activity. This is why the September Central Committee plenum heard the demand not to await instructions from above but to act immediately and decisively. It is important to ease the tension in society step by step, first and foremost on the consumer market, to reduce waiting lists for housing and to tackle pressing ethnic problems. Given the tension and complexity of the pre-Congress period, the CPSU Central Committee Politburo has reviewed its previous decision and cancelled the holding, this year, of reportbacks in the Party committees and bureaus where this is not stipulated in the Party rules. This will make it possible to concentrate efforts on holding the upcoming political campaigns and on tackling economic and political issues.

This does not mean in the slightest that everything must remain as it was where perestroyka is marking time and where for a lengthy period of time there have been no changes for the better. In such cases the issue of strengthening the leadership of the party organization must be tackled without delay, openly and democratically.

Recently an anxious voice on the role of the working man in the cause of perestroyka can be heard more and more frequently. At the recent meeting at the CPSU Central Committee with workers collective farmers, and members of the central elective organs of the CPSU, no small number of just remarks and proposals were expressed, including on the issue of representation in the highest organs of power and the elective organs of the party. The conclusion was that we must bring fully into play its revolutioanry spirit and creative potential—I mean the potential of the working class—in the interests of perestroyka.

Comrades, I would like to dwell on one more issue of fundamental importance: I mean socialism, what society we have built and where we are going. In other words, we are returning again to an issue which we are discussing constantly—the sense and destiny of perestroyka. It could be said, is it the time now to theorize, when vital, practical issues face us in such an acute way? However, at meetings, in letters to the Central Committee, in the press and on television these issues are constantly being discussed. Besides, as Lenin stressed, if we don't sort out general issues, we will be constantly stumbling upon them at literally every step.

It must be said that it is just those forces which have begun a frontal attack against the party which strive strenuously [as heard] to fundamentally confuse these issues. The aim of these theoretical attacks on the party is obvious. It consists of presenting the party in the eyes of the people as one which has suffered a breakdown in the sphere of theory too. But it is exactly the party which has resolutely rejected many outdated dogmatic theoretical goals. It is the party which has put forward new theorectical concepts which make up the core of the policy of perestroyka. Its conception was born and strengthened in the course of all of the party's work and was enriched by new ideas and realities.

We are also learning by our own mistakes and sometimes receive bitter, but very useful lessons. It cannot be otherwise, since this is something living and creative. Here I cannot help naming the 27th Party Congress, the January and June plena of the Central Committee of 1987, the documents of the 70th anniversary of October, the 19th Party Conference and the March and last plena of the Central Committee of this year. All of these are important and serious steps in understanding the essence and destiny of perestroyka, in the understanding of what we want to arrive at in the cause of renewal of socialist society.

Socialism is one of the most powerful ideas which ever gripped the minds of people. Paradoxically, just here, at home, you can hear voices saying that supposedly the socialist idea is some kind of fruit of intellectual fantasy, a certain anomaly not corresponding to human nature, that is, deprived of substance and future.

Those are not the voices which reflect the opinion of communists and workers and the profound trends of the historical process. The CPSU firmly stands on principled positions. It remains devoted to the socialist ideals, socialist principles, and resolutely stands against dogmatism and defends a creative approach to theory, including the theory of socialism.

Our people made a choice in October of 1917, and despite the deformations of socialism and its Leninist concept which have taken place in the past, we will firmly go along this path. We say perestroyka is the renewal of socialism, but not its dismantling. We say perestroyka is revolutionary transformation, the elimination of the deformations of socialism, but not the restoration of capitalism. We say perestroyka is the revival of creative Marxism, a new awareness of the Leninist ideas, the affirmation of new approaches and methods of work under which the most important thing is being reborn—the creative potential of the people, of the man of labor.

In resolving the urgent problems of perestroyka—foodstuffs, housing, and others—in carrying out radical economic reform, the political transformation of our system, and the renewal of relations between the nationalities, we are also thinking about the fundamental theoretical foundations of our work.

We are striving to define the strategic aims of the development of socialism and the ways for achieving these aims in the nearest future. The preparations for the next 28th CPSU Central Committee Congress will serve that also, as will the elaboration of a party program of action for the immediate future.

Now, it is not just the ideological and theoretical foundations of socialism that are being actively discussed. The lessons of the path travelled by our country are also being discussed. Various points of view are given concerning the past; at the same time, sometices nihilistic attitudes towoard what has been manifested themselves are voiced. The October Revolution and the subsequent history of the country are represented as a mistake, a tragic chance occurrence that destroyed the natural course of events, and brought nothing to the people except suffering.

What attitude should one have toward all that? The party's point of view on this account is expressed in the documents dedicated to the 70th anniversary of October. We are not rejecting our history. We cherish every day of it in our memory. We see both the good and the bad in the past, giving both their due. At the same time, life moves forward so swiftly that we look upon many events and periods of history in a different way, evaluating them in a more definite and concrete manner. We are going further in interpreting the sources and trends of our society's historic development. The path we have journeyed along is an invaluable, unique experience which must become the object of profound, interested, unbiased study and interpretation. We may move forward with a clear understanding of what dangers may lie in store for us, and what needs to be done to avert them. This bears out the well-known Leninist thought that during the agonizing birth of a new social system it will be necessary, not once, not twice, but many times, to overcome most serious errors and to redo everything from the beginning. That task can only be resolved once one has liberated oneself, both from prejudices of defunct dogma and from prejudices of lifeless pseudo innovations. The question of the new approach to socialism, to the new visions of it, of its main characteristics has acquired fundamental significance in the course of revolutionary perestroyka. By what were we usually guided? Let us recall the main principles of the Leninist concept: social ownership of the main means of production, guaranteeing the rapid rise of productive forces; allocation according to labor; the overcoming of social and ethnic antagonisms; working for oneself and not for an exploiter; not only formal; but also real socialization, the real transformation of working people into the owners of all social production; enterprise, competition, bold initiative, and at the same time a planned character, understood as conscious proportionality; the development of the national economy as a system of civilized cooperative members; the cultural revolution, understood not as a rejection of the old culture but as the acquisition of all the wealth of world culture; the power of the soviets, the power of the whole people, the irreconclable struggle against bureacracy; and Collectivism, the subordination of the development of production to the interests of man, to the satisfaction of his demands.

A society oriented toward socialist democracy, self-government of the masses, toward cultural growth of the people, and the establishment of conditions for comprehensive development of personality. Do these principles maintain their significance? Undoubtedly. Moreover, perestroyka is transferring them to the category of being real, since they were often merely proclaimed in the past. At the same time, today it has been discovered, absolutely definitely, that these very principles, and the criteria of the degree of socialism which are based on them, require the rendering of concrete expression to them and an increase in their qualitative level, taking into consideration the processes of development of many countries. As Lenin said, a transformation in our entire viewpoint on socialism is required. The practice of perestroyka has not only revealed shortcomings, primitivism and even elements of Utopianism in the image of socialism which became established, but has also demonstrated that it is necessary to approach in a fundamentally new way the determinataion of its future face. Renouncing an authoritarian and bureaucratic, command and order approach to socialism, advances the task not of creating some new ideal model, but definition of those specific features of it which proceed from the practice of perestroyka, which are not imposed artificially on reality but grow out of it and are born of life itself. At the center of the renewed socialist idea are man and the supreme value and the task of practical renewal of socialism by means of creating such social, economic and political structures which became the means, with man being the end, which actually ensure that the entire social system turns round to face man. In the economic sphere, the changes in our view of socialism consists in developing various forms of realization of socialist ownership, in creating new economic mechanisms, wich efficiently organize and stimulate the labor activity of people. In the political aspect, the renewal of socialism is happening in the process of perestroyka, also the path of the utmost development of democracy, of the provision of genuine sovereignty of the people, the establishment of the law governing state.

Here, a cardinal change in our viewpoint about socialism is happening, too. The process of democratization includes the establishment of the corresponding political and legal mechanisms, on the one hand, and an increase in the development of the political culture of the masses, and the formation of a tradition of respect for the law which obliges one to resolve all problems which arise within the framework of the law and in accordance with the democratic procedure which has been worked out. The contours of the renewed political system which emerges in the process of perestroyka are already acquiring an outline, notably as a result of the activity of the First Congress of People's Deputies, and of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

The second stage of the reform of the political system lies ahead, one connected with the elections to, and of work in a new manner of, the local soviets, in which millions of working people participate.

The question of the renewal of socialism in the social sphere is becoming more and more deep and well-founded. From the very beginning of perestroyka, the formation and realization of social programs have become one of the priority directions in policy.

But we have only just started to bring it in accordance with human requirements and principles of socialism. We are only at the beginning of the way. Here qualitative reforms should be carried out, and they enter in an integral way our conception of the present and future of the socialist society, its revolutionary renovation on the paths of perestroyka. Processes taking place in the sphere of interethnic relations influence all sides of our life. Perestroyka literally splashed out the mass of problems and contradictions that had accumulated here onto the surface of the public life. It is not accidental that in a number of places in our country in recent time interethnic conflicts and ethnic movements in defense of one's own sovereignty, economic independence and culture have been arising. Of course, phenomena bearing not ethnic but social roots, and above all lack of solution for a number of socioeconomic problems, violation of people's basic human rights and the resistance of corrupt elements, frequently come out in the form of ethnic contradictions. In the arguments and clashes of opinions that have found, I think, an integral expression in the platform of the CPSU on Nationalities Policy in Modern Conditions, a new image of our Soviet Federation, that combines the interests of national sovereignty and development, and the general interests of the union and the people of our country harmoniously has started to take shape. The interethnic relations within its framework should be built on the principles of democracy and equality, mutual respect and free development of people. Even now the most radical changes leading to renovation of socialism are taking place in the sphere of ideology, culture and education. Perestroyka opens a wide scope for intellectual development of a human being himself and the society he lives in, for working out of the attitude to labor appropriate to the modern tasks, for an increase in the level of professionalism and competence, and for moral purification and improvement of the society. We must arrive at such a society where every man is sure that his abilities and work, knowledge and the best moral qualities will find support and conditions for their realization for the benefit of the individual and the society. We can't fail to see that many processes of the renewal of socialism are in fact processes characteristic of the whole of civilization, in this or other form taking place on a different social ground too. The necessity of solving global problems common for everyone has started to acquire an ever greater share in the life of mankind. Terrible dangers are threatening mankind, and the possibility itself of eliminating them depends upon combining efforts. The interests of mankind as one whole are objectively becoming a considerably significant landmark in the life of every people and every state, because the saving of the life of the civilization is the condition and prerequisite of the further development of mankind and solution of the specific problems of every separate people and state. The new concept of socialism is being formed gradually in proportion to the intensification of the perestroyka, in the interraction of practices that are fleeing themselves from dogmatic stereotypes of theory. At the vanguard of this process there is the Party, which manifests theoretical, as well as practical and political initiative. It is obvious that the development of the theory of scientific socialism at the modern level and the working out of the whole scope of problems relating to it are becoming the priority task of our social science, especially on the eve of the next 28th CPSU Congress. I am finishing my speech. I wish you, my dear comrades, all communists and workers of Ukraine, every success in solving tasks and vital problems that affects the fundamental interests of Soviet people. [applause] [end recording]

Gorbachev Interviewed

LD2809235789 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1830 GMT 28 Sep 89

[Text] [Announcer] After the plenum, our special correspondent Igor Zorin asked Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev to answer several questions. Here is the recording.

[Begin recording] [Gorbachev] The plenum is an important and major plenum. I think the people in the Ukraine and in the Soviet Union will be satisfied with its results and with the decisions that were passed. The plenum has demonstrated the great potential which is contained in the Ukrainian Communist Party, and its orientation toward the perestroyka processes. It has demonstrated the cohesion of the Central Committee and the unity surrounding it, and I think that we saw that the plenum was open to major changes.

[Zorin] Mikhail Sergeyevich, I was present in the hall, and I thought that you were concerned during this plenum?

[Gorbachev] No, no. I was very satisfied with it. Very satisfied. We were sitting there [Gorbachev laughs] and I was distracting Vladimir Vasiliyevich [Shcherbitskiy] so he didn't get agitated. No, I must say that it's good that the plenum—at the plenum itself—added its own considerations, in addition to the proposal which was elaborated collectively, and proceeded along that path. It is precisely confirmation, you understand, that there are such healthy processes also in this very important political body, in the Ukrainian Communist Party, in a large republic. That is good.

[Zorin] And the fact that an alternative factor emerged at the plenum?

[Gorbachev] That is good, normal. I welcome it. I welcome it.

[Zorin] Mikhail Sergeyevich, one final question. How do you evaluate the party's policy on the cadre issue at today's stage in perestroyka?

[Gorbachev] I think that this is the central issue of its work. Why? Because today success or failure boils down, as a rule, to this, to the abilities of our cadres, to their methods of work, to their understanding of the newness of the tasks, to their ability to comprehend and understand how it is necessary to act in the new situation. Therefore, I would put it this way. In a good way, I am dissatisfied with the way in which we still are acting. But realization of the fact that this is one of the important directions, one of the main directions, is occurring in the party. Support is being given both to the party and, on the one hand, to those who have shown themselves to be, during the years of perestroyka, active advocates of it who are capable to conduct and take on their shoulders the new concerns. I see how across the country the party organizations are becoming the initiators of a solution to many cadre questions. This once again is precisely in the interests of perestroyka proceeding successfully and producing results.

[Zorin] Mikhail Sergeyevich, you are the initiator, generally, of a new idea in the practice of the life of our party of saying good-bye in a good way to former party leaders—Comrade Shcherbitskiy in this instance.

[Gorbachev] I think all this should be, so to speak, a manifestation of democracy, of our new relations in society, of human relations, so that everything does not seem extremely secretive when there is an election; rather all should be decided above board and in a good atmosphere. We should say good-bye to a person, if he did everything in a good way, with us giving him his due. I also do not exclude the fact that when decisions become ripe, things need to be decided. When life requires it, when some mistakes or other have been committed, that is another matter. I think that we need to accumulate strength and experience in this respect, so that democracy functions in the party and in society, and so that those normal processes might continue with fresh forces being attracted and the generations always changing, and people who have done much for the country are seen off in a good way.

[Zorin] May I ask you this question? Perhaps it is even personal? What impresses you about the new leader of the Communists of the Ukraine—Comrade Ivashko? After all, in the Communist...

[Gorbachev, interrupting] Much, and things were said about this. Generally, in my opinion, he is a person of such a new formation. Vladimir Vasiliyevich says if I [Shcherbitskiy] were 20 or 30 years younger, I would be ready to work as second secretary under him. Why is this? Because he is very much an open person for the comrades, for collective work. He is intelligent and cultured, and simply very accessible. His methods today are precisely those which fit in most organically with our ideas of how relations ought to be built in our party and in our society at the stage of perestroyka and democratization.

[Zorin] Mikhail Sergeyevich, thank you. Excuse me if I ask Comrade Ivashko one question. [laughter] Comrade Ivashko, one question, just one question. Please. And so Vladimir Antonovich Ivashko, the new first secretary of the Central Committee of the Ukrainian Communist Party, is giving an interview to All-Union Radio. What is your credo as a party leader?

[Ivashko] To live for people. That means to strengthen the party, the sole force which is capable of consolidating society and of taking it out onto those frontiers which our people are worthy of.

[Zorin] How do the issues of party upbuilding and of nationalities policy blend in your work? How do you see them?

[Ivashko] These are matters which are very closely linked, dialectically connected. The party is an internationalist organism. This says it all.

[Zorin] Thank you. I wish you success.

[Ivashko] Goodbye. [end recording]

Addresses Kiev Residents

LD2909005389 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 28 Sep 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] After the plenum Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev talked to the residents of Kiev.

[Gorbachev] If one were to explain the point behind what we have conceived, perestroyka and (?the whole cause), it is to give more to the local soviets, the city soviets, and rayon soviets, and for their enterprises—on their territory—to pay money into their budgets, so that the soviets obtain, (?are provided with), several million [words indistinct]...so that the deputies who represent the local population can solve their own problems. The republics [words indistinct]. In a country this huge it is impossible for all issues, even the simplest ones, to be resolved in Moscow. Is such a thing really possible?

[Man in crowd] Of course not, and we...

[Gorbachev, interrupting] No, so this is where perestroyka is mainly directed, so that just like with enterprises we give them greater rights. Incidentally, they have already begun to make use of them, they have begun to develop construction of social amenities and housing, but this is all probably still just beginning. At the present session of the USSR Supreme Soviet we will be adopting a law on local soviets, on republican soviets, on the economic independence of the republics, so there is going to be a great deal in this area, a very great deal. This autumn we will be making some very major decisions [words indistinct]

[Man] Ninety-nine percent are (?overdoing it)...

[Gorbachev, interrupting] You must have hope, but on the understanding that (?there is some give and take).

[Woman in crowd] Quite right.

[Gorbachev] I'm pleased that although people didn't pay a lot of attention or look very closely when we began everything from the top, they are now [word indistinct] which means that things are on the move. Things are on the move. This probably won't be so easy; it won't be so easy, you know. Either for those who have been fulfilling leadership functions, or for those who have been working in factories, in the fields, raising animals, because in the past it was possible simply to go and (?sign a contract) for how much? Ten, at the minimum, or twelve. If they didn't offer twelve you could go off somewhere else. Isn't that right? Now you have to hand over the goods and receive [words indistinct]...whether it costs, ten, twelve or thirty, but if there are no results it could even be [word indistinct] this is what things should be like everywhere... [words indistinct] that levelling-down, those pay bonuses where one person is paid more than he earned and next door there are people who would like to work hard but (?don't see the point). All these issues must now be thoroughly (?chewed over) so that people work like in a beehive, with everyone pulling his weight and doing his bit for this common beehive home of ours. It's fine to say share it out, share it out...you can share things out, but as soon as oil prices fell and good turnover had to be cut—and oil prices fell by three times—everything contracted all of a sudden, and it turned out that all we were sharing was the oil proceeds. But that's (?not proper work), selling off your resources like that.

So what we have to do, in fact, is (?start) again, organize our lives anew. That's why we want to give workers rights but responsibility as well, so that (?the whole country) together [words indistinct]. But some are very good at seizing rights for themselves; some have fitted in well with democracy and perestroyka. Some of the cooperatives, for example, that have cropped up and know how to empty your pockets—this is another issue that, as you saw, we are now debating keenly at the Supreme Soviet. I think the way we have to look at things is this: If we want to save the cooperative movement—and it must be saved, it's needed. There are cooperatives that will help you to repair something or to do something, you know.

[Voice from the crowd] They build roads.

[Gorbachev] They build roads, and various goods. This is a good thing, but those that load up with goods from the depots or shop stores in the middle of the night and then sell them at twice or triple the price, they have to be closed, you understand.

[Crowd] Exactly.

[Gorbachev] So to save the good cooperatives, the cooperative movement, we have to deal a blow to those graspers. That's the way to look at it.

[Crowd] Right.

[Gorbachev] That's what we have to do.

[Man in crowd] You've left the Supreme Soviet session. Are you not worried that someone might [words indistinct]

[Gorbachev] No, this is [changes thought] What I would say is the following. I was amazed at the way the Supreme Soviet changed before my very eyes, and people are so interested—investigating day and night to try and understand the processes. Even when they come up against new issues for the first time, there are very many responsible people, very many—most of them are responsible people. There's also a noisy group of (?deputies) [words indistinct]. Did you listen to my introductory remarks? I put it straight; I said comrades, let's make this Supreme Soviet businesslike; let's have a proper session, because there are lots of problems and lots of expectations. People are expecting many solutions to their questions and it is intolerable for us now to play at games of pure democracy and procedural issues. The people won't put up with it.

[Voice from crowd] How are the ethnic problems to be solved?

[Gorbachev] The way I mentioned, that's how to do it, with no going back. No going back. So, support the platform; it's clear and precise. All those who wish to introduce seeds of discord into our home, those forces must be isolated. Before all this they were living fine, but suddenly they began—problems arose that disturb us. I think that it has to be tackled further on the basis of the platform.

[Voice] What do you think of the Narodnyy Rukh?

[Gorbachev] Well, all movements, comrades—I don't want to single out your Narodnyy Rukh—all the funds, and all the clubs—that have arisen within the framework of perestroyka and that give people the opportunity to be active, and to put forth their standpoints and their attitudes—and all places where things are being done and solved, all this must be welcomed. It must be welcomed, because this is what we wanted. We wanted our people to become actively involved in all processes. But those in this or that movement or who are exploiting this perestroyka process, openness, glasnost and are starting to confront us with separatism or nationalism, who are inflaming, stirring things up and acting by demagogy, this must be cut short. So I am in favor of healthy public movements that actively assist perestroyka.

[Voice from crowd] Are we in an economic crisis or is it still to come? What do you think? [laughter from crowd]

[Gorbachev] I think that we are in a state of crisis, but that we have begun recovering from it. We are now in the most difficult situation. We are moving away from the command methods, from the enforcement of a strict plan and supervision of everything, but as the new forms come in what's happening is that contracts are made but they are not always obligatory. Just today I had a meeting. The directors came up and told me that their supplies are not fulfilling their contractual obligations. Their plans are going down the drain, so to speak, and the enterprise is idling. That's the first thing.

So you see, things still have to settle down. Or else, enterprises have been given independence and will immediately shove all their money into the pay packets. They've just stopped bothering about all the technical reconstruction issues, the program issues, and even social matters are not always being tackled. But this will be felt in the future. So, you know, there's a complex process going on. It's the most difficult time, when we have to understand how to live in the new way. So I think that this difficult situation, as I said, will be very tense for the next year or two, but I'm certain that we have felt out these main avenues. As they say, everyone has to become a bit more clever, understand everything, yet not panic, not panic.

[Woman in crowd] How do you manage to bear a country of so many millions on your shoulders? How much [words indistinct]?

[Gorbachev] During the Congress of People's Deputies my mother was listening, and she said why is he doing all this?...

[Woman] Why?

[Gorbachev] She said he ought to come home to me and drop it all. [everyone laughs] So your words sound to me like my mother's. But you can't, you know. The country now believes; people now believe. And I am convinced that we are doing things the way they should be done. So it's all the way, all the way.

[Woman] To bear a country like this on your shoulders.

[Gorbachev] Together, together [words indistinct]

[Woman] Yes, together.

[Gorbachev] All the best.

[Crowd] All the best.

Returns to Moscow

LD2809181489 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1803 GMT 28 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow, 28 Sep (TASS)—Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, returned today to Moscow for his 1-day trip to Kiev. In the Ukrainian capital he took part in a plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the republic.

More on Gorbachev Remarks at Award Ceremony

PM2809133389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Sep 89 Second Edition pp 1-2

[TASS report: "Recognition From the People, Recognition From the State. Awards Presentation in the Kremlin"]

[Excerpts] Nobody was late for the award ceremony. At precisely noon on 27 September M.S. Gorbachev, the head of the party and the state, met with the award recipients under the vaults of the Great Kremlin Palace. However, the ceremony only started at 1240.

These 40 minutes were taken up by a spontaneous discussion essentially generated by the joint need for it. The discussion focused on matters currently of concern to the country's leadership and its citizens. There was talk of responsibility, discipline, respect for the law, the breaking down of mechanisms hampering the development of initiative at the local level, the strengthening of the soviets' autonomy, interethnic relations, cadre policy, and the progress of the USSR Supreme Soviet's fall session...

One sensed how this full dialogue caught up both Mikhail Sergeyevich and his audience—cosmonauts, cultural figures, enterprise directors, scientists, workers, and working people from collective and state farms. One sensed how it "fueled" both sides, equally concerned in a state fashion about the problems engendered by perestroyka, and equally interested in finding ways of solving them. This was a dialogue of like minds devoted to the cause of perestroyka and believing in its irreversibility and success.

And it was no accident that when the award ceremony began M.S. Gorbachev's first words were:

I am glad to have had this meeting, where I felt complete mutual understanding of what is now being done in the country within the framework of perestroyka, understanding of the real difficulties which we must surmount in bringing the country onto the broad path of development.

Now we must work better, Mikhail Sergeyevich continued. People may say: "Work better" again. But what can we do? In order to achieve real change in the economy, social development, and the improvement of people's lives, cities, villages, and our entire land, we really must work very well. Here in the Kremlin are those who have distinguished themselves, above all in work. They represent the working class, the peasantry, and the intelligentsia.

I congratulate you for having won the recognition of your collectives, your people, and your state, and for having won the motherland's high awards. Take pride in them and wear them. I say this thinking back to my recent meeting at the Central Committee with workers and peasants who said: We are doing everything to put our whole weight behind the country so that it may stand firm, develop, and improve. That has always been the case. Our land is founded and continues to be founded on working people. And there is no reason for us to be reticent about our well deserved and honestly earned working awards.

M.S. Gorbachev went on to expand on the idea of the future of perestroyka voiced during the discussion in St. George's Hall. That which will forever determine our destiny,—bearing in mind the role played by our state and people in world affairs—the destiny of socialism, and the direction which the world will take may be resolved in the next few months and the next year or two.

We proposed the idea of perestroyka, but it is the people themselves who have suffered in order to achieve it. Perestroyka is proceeding, but it has thrown up so many problems and there are so many new tasks to be resolved! Our people are capable of this now that they have been set free, that they have, perhaps for the first time, appreciated themselves, and recognized and seen our society the way it is. The last few years have reaffirmed yet again that there is enormous potential in the Soviet people. And the things that currently worry and alarm us and that we should eradicate should not dismay us. The main thing is that people are in favor of new forms of life, a good atmosphere in the country, and a good feeling about themselves.

We can now say that perestroyka is happening, the general secretary stressed. Until recently it was called a "revolution from the top." Now it relies on the broadest social strata from below. All of society has been set in motion, and this is the guarantee of the irreversibility of perestroyka. I do not know who would dare say that it will be achieved without losses and mistakes—it won't. But we must all be more determined to look for the optimum solution to all problems, even the most complex.

Nobody is likely to claim that there is a easy route. I think that anyone who promises easy ways of solving the immense problems we are tackling is conning the people. This means that there should be a high degree of responsibility, organization, and discipline in all society. Discipline is always necessary, particularly now.

Of course, perestroyka has produced great expectations, and it cannot be said that they are groundless. I would like to reiterate that in order for expectations to be borne out we need to change a great deal in the country and in people themselves. The expected results will not come about by themselves. It is for us to implement our plans.

It is particularly pleasant for me to say this surrounded by people who have already done a great deal for the motherland, and I am sure they will do a great deal more useful and remarkable work, M.S. Gorbachev said in conclusion. Once again I cordially congratulate you on behalf of the CPSU Central Committee, the Supreme Soviet, the government, and our people. I wish you great creative success, good health, initiative, and firmness of spirit.

M.S. Gorbachev began presenting the awards. [Passage omitted]

Having congratulated and greeted everybody, Mikhail Sergeyevich chatted warmly with each individual recipient as he presented the awards, wishing them good luck.

In their reply statements the award recipients expressed profound gratitude to the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Supreme Soviet, and the Soviet Government for the high assessment of their work, and gave assurances that they would continue to devote every effort to the service of the motherland and the cause of perestroyka.

At the end of the ceremony everyone assembled for the traditional souvenir photograph.

A.I. Lukyanov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and other officials attended the award ceremony.

Commentary Explains Decision on Brezhnev Award

LD2909100989 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0500 GMT 29 Sep 89

[Text] You will already be aware that the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium decree on the award of the Order of Victory to Leonid Ilich Brezhnev has been rescinded. A TRUD correspondent was told at the Awards Department of the Supreme Soviet Secretariat that this decision was made because many people had expressed dissatisfaction over the fact that former state leaders, who had compromised themselves while in office, retained all their decorations. Such demands are being put forward with regard to Rashidov, Medunov, Kunayev, Grishin, Suslov, and others. However, there is no doubt that the official decision on the awards to former leaders should not be turned into a campaign. There must be careful investigation into specific cases.

Meanwhile, some situations are clear-cut, as they say, including that of the Order of Victory to Leonid Ilich Brezhnev. The reason for the revocation of the decree was his nonconformity with the statute of the order. Judge for yourselves. The Order of Victory is awarded to persons of the Supreme Command Staff of the Soviet Army for the successful staging of combat operations on several—or one—fronts, as a result of which the situation altered radically in favor of the Soviet Army. But the wording concerning the award to the former general secretary is as follows: For his great contribution to the victory of the Soviet people and their Armed Forces, for his outstanding services in strengthening the country's defense capability, and for his development and consistent implementation of the Soviet state's peaceful foreign policy. And so on.

The deputies' commission considered it opportune to propose that the Supreme Soviet Presidium should rescind this decree. It should be added that soon after Leonid Ilich Brezhnev's death his widow turned in all his awards to the state.

Estonia Said To Be Experiencing 'Cold War'

PM2809132589 Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA in Russian 8 Sep 89 p 4

[EDAZI-attributed article by Ya. Kaplinskiy: "Civil War and We"]

[Text] A memorial to Konstantin Pyats was unveiled in Takhkuranna 25 June 1989. This was a tremendous event for Estonian patriots and one more sign of the changes taking place and of the awakening hopes. At roughly the same time a polemic flared up with new acuteness and force between two patriotic wings—compromisers and intransigents. Everything points to the fact that the intransigents have an allergy to the Communist Party and its members and would like to sever all relations with the authorities, who, in their opinion, are occupiers and their minions. We seem to have enough people who trust neither Vyalyas, nor Toome, nor Ryuytel, nor Savisaar, nor the late President Pyats. They evidently did not realize that, formally, Pyats remained president of Estonia right up until its incorporation in the Soviet Union and signed all the outwardly legitimate documents of the occupying authorities, which established the abolition of Estonia's independence. Nor did they think that the situation of Pyats and of our present leaders and their actions are in many ways similar. Now, as then, the central power leaves the leaders almost no room to maneuver and sometimes altogether excludes such a possibility. But in some cases, when it is a matter of Pyats, we are undoubtedly ready to forgive and forget everything, while in other cases we are not. In my opinion, we have neither the moral right nor reasonable grounds to censure our present leaders.

I believe that we have, at last, been lucky with our own politicians: Vyalyas, Toome, Ryuytel, Savisaar, and Titma have shown themselves to be real people's leaders, and if they sometimes grope their way and vacillate, this is more than natural in today's complex and unstable situation. Politicians also learn, sometimes from their own mistakes.

This tense August of strikes has proved a real test for our leaders. My personal understanding of what is happening is this: A cold war has developed in the Soviet Union between innovators and conservatives. The first battle of this war took place in Estonia. It can hardly be said that we won it, but our rivals did not win either. The surrounded fortress did not surrender. The comparison with war is not a metaphor. It is known that modern means of warfare are so apocalyptic that they are used with the greatest caution. Most military hardware is not used and, obviously, never will be used. Instead, a huge diversity of nonconventional means of struggle has appeared: cold war, local outbursts in markets, economic blockades, and so forth. Civil wars can also be unconventional, and we are dealing with just such a thing. In the course of 1 week our government had to resolve a huge number of puzzling tasks which are usually tackled by the headquarters—the enemy's obstinacy had to be countered by the uninterrupted working of vitally important lines of communication. The chief thing is that the government coped with this.

One day, perhaps, we will call all that has happened the first battle in our second unconventional liberation war and we will erect a memorial to those who bravely repulsed its attacks and preserved the lines of communication. They certainly were not members of the Estonian National Independence Party or enthusiastic supporters of antiquity. The majority of them were [communist] party members. Perhaps, finally, we will understand that it is not so important what kind of past Laydoner, Pydder, and Toome had (which of them was a tsarist officer, and which a Lenin Communist Youth League worker). What is important is that they knew logic and were able to make use of it in the right place at the right time.

There are many parallels between the breakthrough in the present strikes and the bygone liberation war. What was then for us a liberation war and is now the people's economic self-defense is just part of a wider struggle. The liberation war was part of the struggle of the peoples of East Europe against old and new imperialism for independence, part of the civil war in Russia. The present struggle is part of what I would call an unconventional civil war in the Soviet Union and in East Europe as a whole.

I do not know why the conservatives have regrouped, built up their forces, and decided to launch an offensive precisely in Estonia. History will provide the answer. Obviously, the situation in Estonia struck them as the most dangerous, and they evidently realized that Estonian self-management [IME] would mark the start of irreversible decentralization and liberalization, depriving many departments and individuals of power. And it is possible that the Estonians' position struck them as vulnerable because of our own uncertainty and inability to find more supporters among the republic's nonindigenous inhabitants or perhaps because there are generally few of us. As regards the timing of the attack, Gorbachev's vacation played its part here, and the conservatives' position in Moscow had obviously been strengthened (in their speeches the Tallinn members of the strike committee referred to the absence of Gorbachev and "their" people in the capital).

The fact that we are dealing not just with a punitive operation against Estonia but with a broader action is confirmed by the appeal from the secretariat of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic writers' organization to settle scores with the nationalists. On reading this document attentively, you can see for yourself that the warnings and threats are, in fact, directed against supporters of perestroyka in Moscow and that they are accused of letting the people get out of hand and not instilling order in the state. We are merely an example of such disintegration, and our nationalism is a weed that a diligent gardener is obliged to root up. The appeal should be taken not as an accusation addressed to the weed but as an accusation addressed to the unskillful gardener—obviously, Gorbachev himself.

It is natural that such actions must provoke a rebuff among the progressive section of the leadership, which can see where the attack is aimed. We have supporters, and the Moscow supporters of liberalization must help us, for we have willy-nilly found ourselves the advanced post of perestroyka, and if we fall, their fall will be very likely. If our leaders are calm and do nothing that is absolutely unacceptable to the liberals in the Kremlin, we will be supported. In the present situation it strikes me as important that our leadership should feel support from the people below and from Moscow above. Therefore Communists, people versed in party politics, are irreplaceable in our leadership. Without technocrats and party bureaucrats we will go to the bottom. In this connection it seems to me that the forecast by Laak, Allik, Kork, and Raydl with regard to the Baltic region's political future, which is attainable thanks to compromises on both sides if each of them has sufficient common sense, is realistic.

Just as we were not alone in our first liberation war, we are not alone now either, only now we do not have supporters in the West and opponents in the East; both are in the East—that is, in the cold war that has developed we have willy-nilly ended up between the conservatives and the liberals. The world today is integrated, and both have support from outside. Fortunately, the correlation of forces is still in favor of the supporters of liberalization: The West is for Gorbachev, and a liberalized Soviet Union is less dangerous to peace and the West's narrow interests than a conservative empire underpinned by military-patriotic ideology. Thinking conservatives have got to realize that the fall of Gorbachev and the coming to power of a grouping of any militarist hue will entail the reorientation of the United States and other Western states toward a new arms race spiral (also a form of nonconventional war), in which the Soviet Union has no chance. That is the kind of intense force field we find ourselves in, but our situation is not yet hopeless.

The fact that we are not alone and that we have allies does not mean that some influential force in the country or abroad pursues the same aims as we do. This is not so. A free, independent Estonia is necessary precisely for those who live in it. It is important that there are forces with an interest in the success of our reform or, at least, in ensuring that it is not halted as a hostile plot. We should not hope for more.

I have already said that the August strikes and the propaganda war by central publiciations against Estonia are part of a wider battle. It did not break out on the initiative of the Russians living here. But this certainly does not mean that the present confrontation in Estonia should not be taken seriously. We must do a great deal to normalize our relations. Evidently, the two sides have a poor idea of each other's intentions and anxieties. The Russians have not understood the Estonians' pushiness and despair or the fact that state independence is something indelible and irreversible and that the Estonians have never reconciled themselves to and never will resign themselves to the status of an imperial province. And the Estonians have been unable to discern the uncertainty of the Russians, their fear of a wave of national upsurge. For people who have lived their lives moving from place to place and who have felt at home in Estonia for the first time, this is natural. It is hardly a natural situation when it is better to live abroad than in the motherland. It is not in our power to change the situation in Russia, and we should not hope for reemigration. We should realize that our non-Estonian fellow citizens will remain with us for a long time. It is not in our power to change this, but it is in our power to make relations between the two national communities tolerable and even good, after the example of the polyglot Chud area [Prichudye] [the Chud are an Estonian ethnic subgroup living in Russia]. The way of life of the Estonians differs from that of the Russians, and a certain separateness with regard to places of settlement and professional preferences will remain between them during the life of the next few generations. We must give the Russians an official and solemn guarantee that no one will deport them from here, deprive them of work, or in any way encroach upon them.

Let us hope that sooner or later we will hold talks with organizations which really represent the local Russian population and defend their interests. The International Movement has so far mainly engaged in reeducating Estonians and endeavored to din into us how grateful we should be to Soviet power, how poverty-stricken the Estonian Republic really was, and how unattractive the black, blue, and white flag is. Such attempts are either naive or provocative and can arouse in Estonians nothing but irritation or irony. Nevertheless, there are businesslike proposals in speeches by the International Movement's members, but it is very difficult to extricate them from the excessive ideological didactics. But this must be done.

We must be particularly attentive to the opinions and wishes of Russian-speaking labor collectives. We must find suitable and accessible conditions for including them in the IME economy, whether in the form of worker self-management, as in Yugoslavia, or somehow differently. We must be flexible on questions of citizenship. Why not provide for the possibility of preserving USSR citizenship for those who do not wish to change it, as many citizens of British colonies did, retaining their citizenship of Great Britain—in this way they felt more confident in life. There are more than enough problems and solutions to them, but there is still a lack of a solid Russian-speaking representation with which it would be possible to discuss them. Let us hope that such a representation will appear, whether in the form of some new organization or as a result of the present movements' evolution.

With the introduction of IME it will be easier for us to explain our intentions. It is in the interests of all of Estonia's inhabitants to halt the collapse of the economy and start gradually building a more humane life. Estonia's future role as an East-West intermediary gives the local Russian people broad opportunities. Great openness and the mastering of English will help to create the neutral soil necessary for closer contacts in the future. The logic of events and interests will bring us closer. In the future Estonia everyone must have the opportunity to live in conformity with his wishes, and this must suit everyone, regardless of the language we speak and where we were born. In the future Estonia there will be no place for those who seek to force people to live after their own manner. There are such people both inside and outside Estonia, and it seems that they will never reconcile themselves to our desire to live freely. The struggle against them is still to come.

This article had already been written when the radio carried the CPSU Central Committee appeal with threats to the Baltic peoples. It did not improve our mood, but neither was it grounds for disappointment, and precisely disappointment is the purpose of psychological warfare. You will not enhance the economies of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania with tanks. Tanks and the old regime will not resolve a single problem or cure the empire of its fatal illness. In Poland, where the problems and tension are similar to ours, the previously banned "Solidarity" is creating a government, and former political prisoners are engaged in rescuing the homeland from disaster. Such is the logic of Polish history. Our logic is no different either. We were the first, and we are not the last.

Estonian Deputies Protest CPSU Party Statement

PM2009161589 Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA in Russian 1 Sep 89 p 1

["Appeal to the Peoples of the Soviet Union and to USSR People's Deputies" adopted by USSR people's deputies from Estonia]

[Text] We USSR People's Deputies in whom the population of the Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] have placed their trust consider it necessary to speak on the political situation in the Estonian SSR.

Thanks to the perestroyka course begun by the CPSU, processes of the political, social, and economic renewal of society have begun in Estonia in the past few years. In some spheres of the republic's social life, the pace of renewal is somewhat ahead of the rate of those processes in other union republics. The first positive results of the democratization of society and the prospect of implementing the concept of republic economic accountability devised in the republic—all this has united the majority of the people around the perestroyka program, which is of crucial significance for ensuring society's real emergence from the state of crisis.

Recently, however, forces interested in slowing down perestroyka throughout the Soviet Union, including Estonia, have begun interfering increasingly in the republic's internal political processes.

The means chosen to achieve these goals are the dissemination of disinformation, the inflaming of national strife, the organization of economic sabotage, and attempts to discredit the policy of the republic's leadership. For that purpose political strikes have been organized at a number of all-union enterprises whose workers often do not understand the real problems of the republic's social and economic development. Activists of the so-called International Movement, citing the reforms that are being implemented in the republic, have been trying for a number of months to instill in the republic's population a feeling of uncertainty over the future. Those attempts were considerably stepped up after the USSR Supreme Soviet adopted a positive decision on the transfer of the Baltic republics to regional economic accountability.

The result of these actions has been the artificial division of the republic's population into indigenous inhabitants and Russian speakers, who are allegedly subjected to discrimination. Certain articles of the laws on language and on local soviet elections adopted by the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet were chosen as the pretext for a sharp escalation of social tension.

In actual fact, the Law on Language is called upon ultimately to remove the linguistic and consequently cultural discrimination which for many long years passed as the norm for interethnic contact in the Soviet Union. In many regions of Estonia, communication in the Estonian language was impossible even in everyday life, not to mention official and public activity.

The law on language is aimed at establishing the equality of languages in Estonia: An equal knowledge of Estonian and Russian is obligatory now for only a narrow range of Estonian inhabitants—leading workers and workers in the service sphere—regardless of nationality. As for all the other inhabitants of Estonia, their position with regard to language usage will be considerably improved: The Law on Language also guarantees them for the first time the opportunity and right to use Estonian and Russian in equal measure.

As for the law on elections and the residence qualification which has been introduced, the campaign mounted against them may be viewed as a deliberate deception of the public. In fact the residence qualification applies equally to people of all nationalities. Similar principles are applied in virtually all countries of the world as a condition of citizenship or the right to take part in elections. In Estonia, as is well known, the Law on Citizenship of the Estonian SSR has not been adopted. The residence qualification is necessary for the revival of the now so necessary sense of being in charge, without which the reforms of economic and territorial self-management and the effective protection of the environment are essentially impossible. Ensuring the preconditions for restoring the sense of being in charge is particularly important in Estonia, through which a stream of migrants several times larger than the republic's population has passed in the postwar years.

The campaigns against the perestroyka processes in Estonia begun outside the republic do not help to stabilize the situation in Estonia and in fact try to achieve the opposite result. One example of that, in particular, is the recent appeal by the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Union of Writers Secretariat, which is an example of unwarranted interference in the internal affairs of another sovereign republic at a time when the organization in question is not even paying due attention to the fact that many peoples are dying out in its own federation.

We believe that for the normalization of the political processes in the republic there must be a political and legal assessment of the historical events of 1939-1940. The longer the delay in condemning the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact and the secret appendices to it is, the harder it will be to explain both to the peoples of the USSR and to the world public the true circumstances of the Baltic republics' entry into the Soviet Union under the leadership of Stalin, Zhdanov, Dekanozov, and Vyshinskiy. Further results of Stalin's nationalities policy in Estonia were the mass repressions against the Estonian people, the forcible deportation of a section of the republic's population to other parts of the country, and the systematic settlement of Estonia with residents of other republics. As a consequence of this policy, the proportion of Estonians on the republic's territory in its present borders fell from 94 percent in 1940 to 60 percent now. This is viewed by the bulk of the population as a deliberate policy whose end result is the destruction of the nation. Despite that fact, the Estonian people showed fortitude and a constructive spirit in the hope that their inalienable right to really guaranteed self-determination can be achieved within the framework of general democratization, perestroyka of the political system, and the reorganization of the federations' foundations. These aspirations are reflected in the Declaration on the Sovereignty of the Estonian SSR adopted unanimously by the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet 16 November 1988. Despite the fact that similar declarations have now been adopted by the Lithuanian and Latvian SSR Supreme Soviets too, the central mass media have still not published the texts of these documents. But there has been no shortage of various arbitrary interpretations of them.

There is also bewilderment at the Statement on the Situation in the Baltic Republics made in the name of the CPSU Central Committee, which was put together without the participation of the Central Committee members who lead these republics. If this is how the central party apparatus shows the Soviet people the way to the rule-of-law state, one wonders what the point of its nationalities policy is at all.

Many of the statement's conclusions are linked to individual extremist manifestations in the Baltic republics. Of course, in conditions of growing pluralism and democracy in the Estonian SSR, as in all other union republics, there are extremists and extremist words. But it is not they which determine the processes of political development in the republic and conclusions based on them cannot be right.

We regard the aforementioned statement as an attempt to deliberately aggravate the situation in order to create an opportunity for the introduction of a special situation or martial law in our republics. It has reached the stage where the "viability" of the Lithuanian, Latvian, and

Estonian nations is threatened with destruction, which is perceived as an allusion to the possibility of genocide. Such threats are fundamentally contrary to the attempts by the forces of democracy and perestroyka to transform the USSR into a truly free union of peoples. This development of events indicates increasing pressure aimed at perpetuating unlawful discrimination against small peoples. We are convinced that no people of the Soviet Union will allow themselves to be used to suppress small peoples.

We in actual fact political development in Estonia has not led to physical clashes stemming from ethnic conflicts. All the social movements in Estonia which support and are pursuing the course of renewing society envisage in their programs only parliamentary forms of political activity precluding all forms of force.

In supporting the course of the further democratization of society throughout the Soviet Union we consider that the following questions should be resolved without delay:

1. Revoke article 6 of the USSR Constitution as the legal basis for a possible rebirth of a totalitarian regime;
2. Create effective guarantees for the exercise of the nations' inalienable right to self-determination;
3. Adopt the principles of the reorganization of the USSR as an entirely voluntary union of truly sovereign republics with equal rights and representation;
4. Adopt a package of measures to remove the state and social structures inherited from the Stalinist totalitarian regime.

We appeal to the peoples of the Soviet Union and to USSR People's Deputies to speak out resolutely against the attempts to torpedo perestroyka, attempts which have made the Baltic republics their target. It is only by understanding and supporting one another that people can hope to make perestroyka irreversible in all the republics and regions of the country.

[Signed] USSR People's Deputies Kh. Aasmyae, A. Aruvald, I. Fyuk, G. Golubkov, I. Gryazin, K. Khallik, A. Khaut, P. Yalakas, Yu. Kakhi, S. Kallas, K. Kiysk, Yu. Kraft, T. Kyabin, M. Lauristin, E. Lippmaa, T. Made, M. Mikiver, T. Ninnas, Yu. Nugis, Kh. Nurm, R. Otsason, V. Palm, V. Pokhla, I. Rayg, I. Raud, V. Saar, E. Savisaar, O. Subbi, E. Tamberg, G. Tynspoyeg, V. Vare, T. Varek, and Yu. Vooglayd.

New Latvian People's Front Program Outlined

PM2809124389 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 28 Sep 89 Morning Edition p 3

[Irina Litvinova report under the rubric "Direct Line. IZVESTIYA's Own Correspondents by the Teletype Machine": "Latvian People's Front Program"]

[Text] Riga—On the eve of its second congress (to be held in Riga 7-8 October) the Latvian People's Front [LPF] has submitted drafts of a new program and statutes for discussion by the republic's inhabitants.

"In accordance with the requirements of the new stage in Latvia's history—the transition to the restoration of independence—the LPF's second program specifies its strategic tasks and ways to promote their implementation," the preamble to this document states.

The draft program is mainly of a declarative nature—most of its points begin with the words: "The LPF believes...." or "The LPF demands...." In the opinion of LPF Chairman D. Ivans, the document is a concept, not a specific action program. Some of its points are provoking debate within the republic. Such as, for example: "The LPF struggles to ensure that representatives of the people of Latvia who have unequivocally manifested a desire to restore Latvia's state independence are elected to higher and local organs of power in Latvia"; "The radical demilitarization of Latvia's territory is to be carried out; the terms of the stationing of the USSR's Armed Forces and the status of its military bases are laid down by a treaty between the highest organs of state power of Latvia and the USSR; the participation of servicemen performing compulsory military service in elections to the highest organs of power in Latvia is to be rejected (with the exception of permanent residents of Latvia drafted for military service)"; "The actions of organizations and parties organizationally subordinate to the USSR or other countries are to cease"; "The LPF supports the creation of equitable juridical, economic, and social conditions for state, private, and mixed ownership, particularly by encouraging private economic activity."

Ya. Vagris, first secretary of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee, expressed his attitude toward the draft program of the People's Front at a meeting with voters: "Let us see," he said, "in what form this document is adopted at the People's Front congress. Comparing it with the action program of the Latvian Communist Party, it is possible to say that they contain quite a lot of points in common. However, I categorically reject the aim of the LPF draft program that Latvia must develop outside the USSR."

There is quite a wide range of opinions on the draft program even among LPF members themselves. The congress will make the final decision on questions to be debated.

Latvian Anti-Army Rally Reported

PM2909094589 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 26 Sep 89 First Edition p 3

[Correspondent Lieutenant Colonel M. Ziyeminsh report: "Strange Appeals. What Representatives of Certain Latvian Informal Associations Are Inciting Young People To Do"]

[Text] ...The bell rang on the tower which soars majestically over old Riga. The people who had gathered on the paving stones of the ancient square fell into funereal silence. They honored with a minute's silence the memory of the young people in military caps whose portraits were set up in a semicircle before an improvised rostrum. These boys, the female compere announced, died or went missing while serving in the Soviet Army. And then a list of 20 names.

Yes, this verified list contains the names of youths whose lives really were cut short tragically in the process of military service. At different times. In very different circumstances. Including as the result of mistakes made by the young soldiers.

The Army, in the person of commanders and political workers, assumed and does assume full responsibility for the fate of those who join it. If an officer fails to keep watch and loses sight of something, he must answer according to all the severity of the laws. I could cite many examples where commanders and political workers have been removed from their posts, demoted, or transferred to the reserve ahead of schedule because of shortcomings in educational work. This was the case when I personally was doing compulsory military service, and this is the case now that my service as an officer is drawing to an end. Only in past years it was not customary to report in the press on accidents in the Army and Navy.

I also know something else: If they had decided to bring to that same Cathedral [Domskiy] Square the portraits of young Letts who had died during the same time in road accidents, as a result of carelessness or a tragic coincidence, they would have been too numerous to set up in a circle right around the rostrum. Unfortunately, misfortunes happen in life and lie in wait equally for a Lett, a Russian, or a Yakut.

Be that as it may, I know for sure that no one in the Army ever seeks excuses or extenuating circumstances. And probably nowhere is there such strict responsibility as in the Army.

Why do I focus attention on this? Because it has a direct bearing on the rally with which I began my account. "Our Sons and Service in the Soviet Army"—that was how its organizers, activists of the Latvian Women's League, originally formulated its agenda. The rally was pegged to the latest draft of young people into the ranks of the Armed Forces.

The idea itself strikes me as topical and worthy of approval. It is no secret that the social roots of that "hazing," for instance, must be sought above all in education. Or, rather, in shortcomings in the education of young people below draft age.

There has recently been an increase in the number of cases of youths drafted from the republic going absent without leave from military units. This was what Private A. Silinsh, for example, did, giving as the reason for his desertion the allegation that he felt unwell in the Army. But no abnormalities in his state of health were detected in hospital. KRASNAYA ZVEZDA recently reported that 13 Lettish servicemen, who were serving in Leningrad Military District, had gone absent without leave from a unit.

These and other recent facts are disconcerting. On going to the rally, I, a professional military man, was expecting to hear constructive proposals for resolving problems connected with preparing for and carrying out service in the Army. And then, after funereal tunes and lowered flags, voices began to be heard. Men's and women's voices, the voices of elderly and young people. Of mothers of present and future soldiers.

"I will not allow my son to serve in an Army which has on its conscience the occupation of Latvia and its subsequent annexation in 1940, the bloody events in Hungary in 1956, the ruthless crushing of the 'Prague spring' in 1968, Afghanistan..." this floated over the square.

"Things have the reached the point," the next speaker said, "where we must fear lest our children become the target of national humiliation...."

The conclusion in both cases was the same: Hardly anything will change substantially until Latvia acquires its own regional combined unit. But someone went further, specifying: We have no need at all of the Army as such, and the border troops would suffice.

"Visual agitation" was couched in the same spirit. "Down with the occupation!"—one poster urged. "Soviet soldier, do you know the bitter taste of a mother's tears?"—another asked. "We demand an end to the terror against our children in the ranks of the Armed Forces!"—a third proclaimed. And further: "Let Latvia's inhabitants serve in Latvia," "A Lettish army for the Lettish republic," "Demilitarized zone for the Baltic...."

The rally participants gave a restrained, if not cold, welcome to the speeches of two Letts—Private R. Lapinskas and Senior Seaman A. Slokenberg. The young servicemen said that they had not encountered nonregulation relations in their units or insults to national dignity in any form. In addition, Slokenberg reported that throughout his naval service he had been able to read periodicals in his native tongue. The rally participants did not accept those arguments. Nor did they let a veteran, a representative of the Association of Lettish Riflemen, who asked to speak, say all he had to say. That was not what they wanted to hear.

On the other hand, how they applauded the speeches of two young people discharged from the Army on health grounds, who complained about their commander's rudeness.

I realized that there were people in the square with specific complaints connected with their sons' service. Of course, every case must be investigated. But not at a rally.

In general, I noticed, the Women's League activists played far from the leading role there. No, they were not the stage managers.

At that same rally the first printed publication of the so-called Latvian rebirth party, which is, it is true, small in size (of the order of 30 members), fell into my hands. This publication, named YUNDA, carried an article by Yu. Vidinsh, party chairman and former head of the "Helsinki-86" group. In the article entitled "What Is to Be Done?" Vidinsh unambiguously orients his supporters in roughly this spirit: "We must organize passive resistance to the occupiers. It is possible to mention as an example in this context refusal to serve in the Soviet Army. Yes, that is dangerous, but is service itself in the occupiers' army really less dangerous?"

You probably could not put it more frankly.

Vagris Discusses CPSU Party Baltics Statement

18001652 Moscow TRUD in Russian 17 Sep 89 pp 1-2

[Report of 15 September Riga interview with Latvian Communist Party Central Committee First Secretary Ya.Ya. Vagris by TRUD special correspondent V. Knyazev: "A Time for Difficult Decisions"]

[Text] [Knyazev] Yan Yanovich, TRUD readers have been following with great interest and sometimes even concern, the events that have taken place in various parts of our country. In their letters to the editorial offices, particularly in connection with the CPSU Central Committee Statement "On the Situation in the Republics of the Soviet Baltic," many of them are asking: "So what is happening there? Please describe for us briefly what is happening today in the republic.

[Vagris] Today, this is about what can be said about the situation in Latvia: It is complex and ambiguous, but in general public life is stable given the high degree of political activeness among the broad masses themselves. People are very interested in the decisions of the recent Latvian Communist Party Central Committee plenum and the program "Along the Path of Latvia's Sovereignty" adopted by the republic Communist Party. There is active discussion of the CPSU Central Committee statement "On the Situation in the Republics of the Soviet Baltic." The range of opinion goes from unconditional support to an extremely critical assessment. The Latvian Communist Party Central Committee Buro and the members of the Central Committee have expressed their opinion in appropriate appeals to the Communist and all workers in the republic. Our position remains unchanged: We favor a sovereign Latvia as part of a qualitative renewal of Soviet federation, and we favor a new status for the Latvian Communist Party as an inseparable part of the CPSU.

Mention should also probably be made of the economy since recently, not only here but also throughout the country the pressure of its problems on the political situation has been increasing. And we therefore think that the introduction from 1 January 1990 of the law "On the Economic Independence of the Latvian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic]" will make it possible in the near future to defuse the social and political situation. In accordance with this document the republic will discharge its own obligations toward the economic complex of the Soviet Union and take part in its development on the basis of contracts and agreements, proceeding from the principles of a mutually advantageous division of labor and equivalent commodity exchange.

We understand, however, that in order to realize this adequately we must deal with many complexities, from those that, to put it graphically, are born in the offices of the all-union departments and establishments, to those concerned with preparations by each enterprise, rural soviet and worker for work under the new conditions. Moreover, the switch to republic cost accounting is being made more complicated by the adverse general economic background. The latest statistical reports indicate that compared with last year growth rates for national product in Latvia have fallen. Supplies of many kinds of light industry output have decreased and there has been no improvement in supplying the population with foodstuffs. In 1988 construction workers in the republic failed to meet plan targets for the commissioning of housing, but even now they are unable to correct the situation.

Things are also complicated with the rural workers. True, the grain harvest has been considerably higher than last year. Record amounts of hay have been produced and milk yields have increased.

Why am I talking in such detail about the economy? Because we have all now been distracted by politics, the whole of society has been politicized. This is fine, but without an economy there is no politics. It is, of course, easier to politicize than to restructure the economy. Today it can be seen that the political processes in the country, and here in the republic, are developing more rapidly, and perestroyka in the economy is being towed along.

[Knyazev] Notwithstanding, Yan Yanovich, let us turn again to the CPSU Central Committee statement. I myself am convinced that today this subject is paramount among any audience. However, it must regrettably be stated that far from everyone shares the lack of concern of the Central Committee, and some are even accusing Moscow of whipping up tension in the republic. For if one analyzes the publications of the unofficial organizations, and even things published in some local newspapers, then one must agree with the conclusion that was reached by the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee Buro, namely, that manifestations of separatism and other sharply negative phenomena can indeed be seen within the republic.

[Vagris] Well, first, I would like to some extent reassure TRUD readers and all those who are about to come to our republic for their vacations, on business trips, or as guests or paying visits to relatives. One might think that something short of street fighting would be taking place in Riga. Nothing of the sort....

Although it is true that in the stormy rush of various kinds of declarations and petitions and everything else that superficially we call "pluralism of opinion" one might hear or read extremist or separatist statements. Things have been reduced to coarse statements against the republic Supreme Soviet and government, and against the party and the Soviet army. One example of this was the recent unsanctioned meeting at the Freedom monument, organized by the so-called Movement for the National Independence of Latvia. There, among other things, one of those in attendance hurled abuse and slander to the extent of saying that members of the communist party "should be hanged." It cannot, therefore, be claimed that there are no grounds for the extremely sharp comments in the CPSU Central Committee statement. And the concern, perhaps even misgivings about perestroyka processes in the republic are quite understandable.

But I would like once again to emphasize the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee's conviction that the external activity of extremist groupings that are trying from various aspects to block the road of perestroyka do not and cannot exert any decisive influence on the process of the renewal of socialism in Soviet Latvia.

[Knyazev] There is now broad discussion in the republic of the draft law on elections, which provides for qualifications for permanent settlement and citizenship, and the resolution that has been adopted on migration. Will this not exacerbate interethnic relations even more, and deepen economic difficulties?

[Vagris] I emphasize that the new draft laws have always come into being with the broad participation of the public, and have, as a rule, been submitted for national debate. Maximum democracy and glasnost has become the rule for the work of the republic's legislators. Yes, and it would be a strange thing to suggest that the highest organ of state power is engaged in creating difficulties and tension in the state that it leads. That would be political suicide. What you are talking about is the result of the stubborn reluctance of certain groups of people and organizations representing their interests to reconcile themselves to the fact that their ambitions or subjective interests are not in line with the state interests of the Latvian SSR. It is not the activity of the legislators or new laws but open or hidden opposition from those groups of people whose personal political ambitions or social privileges will be affected, that is inflaming passions. And, of course, it is not only we who have such persons.

Neither should it be forgotten that in article 76 of the USSR Constitution the all-union republics are invariably declared to be sovereign Soviet socialist states... This is also underpinned in the CPSU draft platform on the national question: the all-union republics are empowered to resolve all matters of state and public life except for those that they voluntarily assign to the all-union level.

On this basis, we must in general raise the question of the implementation of constitutional norms on the sovereignty of the all-union republics. Even non-specialists can see that a number of articles in the USSR Constitution now in force are at variance with the principle of the sovereignty of the all-union republics. I think that first and foremost it is essential to remove this contradiction, and the USSR people's deputies will be taking this up at the 2nd Congress. And then, obviously, we may raise the question of and assess the degree to which the constitutions of the all-union republics correspond to the Constitution of the USSR. It is possible that we are now hearing very serious complaints about provisions that in a few months will be fully constitutional. How shall we then be able to look the people in the face?

[Knyazev] Nevertheless, Yan Yanovich, it have heard—evidently under the influence of all kinds of discussions—that the inhabitants of the republic have been asking you in a concerned manner the following: Will Latvia not find itself in a "economic" blockade—meaning by this the transition to economic independence and the acquisition of full sovereignty?

[Vagris] No, I do not think that this will happen. Why do we hear this? There is a Politburo decision on this score, and a decree from the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet. We have already started to formulate mutual obligations on a contractual basis, so there there can be no blockade. Some kinds of let us say unforeseen circumstances may arise, and evidently will arise. That is life. All kinds of collisions will take place. Take this recent business with gasoline. Our neighbors, the Lithuanians, with whom we are moving on a friendly basis toward economic independence, did not fail to give us gasoline just because they did not want to but in fact were unable to provide it. Such cases may arise. But we understand that under conditions of independence it is essential first and foremost to comply precisely with all contracts, and then you will not let anyone down.

[Knyazev] In this connection permit me to mention another matter that the inhabitants of Latvia have been asking you: "Do you admit of the possibility of the republic's secession from the USSR?" Incidentally, this is precisely the call being made by many of the activists in the People's Front of Latvia.

[Vagris] This is not a new issue. I think that everyone who wants to be a real politician rather than a political demagogue should look at things realistically. I did not see yesterday, nor do I see today, any possibility for Latvia to exist except as part of the Soviet Union. Yes, many slogans have been put forward but but they have no kind of foundation, no sensible program. There is a multitude of various kinds of promises but no one talks about what we shall do or how we shall live. Act on principle: Let us go ahead and then we shall see? Well, you know, this is, to say the least, not a serious approach...

[Knyazev] Today it is impossible to avoid the question of the unofficial associations. The People's Front, Interfront, and the Movement for the National Independence of Latvia are all operating in Latvia. I have the impression that citizens committees—the union of workers—are being set up as a counterweight to the soviets. Do you not have misgivings that these organizations will win in the elections to the local soviets?

[Vagris] The subject of the interrelationship between the party and the traditional public organizations and a number of new public and sociopolitical organizations, and with the unofficial associations and movements is one for special debate. In our interview today I would like to draw your attention to the following.

First and foremost I would not call unofficial those mass organizations that enjoy significant support among the various population groups and strata, that have come into being during the last year and have assumed a very prominent place in the republic's socioeconomic life, and in any event are exerting a very active influence on it. Neither can I agree with the idea that they are all acting as a "counterweight" to the soviets, the party, and the trade unions. The members of the fronts, organizations and movements include many communists and many people who are acting from the positions of perestroyka, firmly defend the position of democratization and glasnost in society, and defend the values and ideals of socialism. I remind you once again that it is not happenstance that in the Latvian Communist Party program for action we have spoken out unambiguously in favor of every possible kind of cooperation with those public and sociopolitical organizations that in their activity are guided by the interests of people of all nationalities living in the republic, and recognize the path of socialist development. This cooperation can and should be built on the basis of open dialogue, mutual tolerance, and opportunities for principled criticism and the expression of differing opinions.

It is in this kind of context that we are looking at the question of the upcoming elections to the republic soviets of people's deputies. And who will win? I am sure that it will be the interests of the people of Latvia and the cause of perestroyka initiated by the party.

I believe that it is essential to emphasize that today many readings are possible because of the lack of a clear-cut legal status for the independent organizations, whatever their direction. We have therefore started to work on a draft law of the Latvian SSR for the public organizations and organs engaged in independent activity, and we intend, with the broad participation of the public and all interested parties, as they say, to carry out this work in quite short time periods.

The just published Latvian Communist Party program for action has defined a principled approach to the building of mutual relations between t party and all other public and sociopolitical organizations. Briefly, it can be formulated thus: contact, dialogue, or discussion with everyone, but constructive cooperation only with those who through their documents and—the main thing—actions affirm their loyalty to the policy of perestroyka and the renewal of socialism. Developing this thesis, we also emphasized that simultaneously the party condemns and rejects any activity aimed at inciting interethnic dissension or overthrowing the existing social order. Our motto remains unchanged: for the sovereignty of Latvia as part of the Soviet Union.

[Knyazev] Yan Yanovich, you have just returned from Moscow from a meeting with M.S. Gorbachev and other CPSU leaders. What are your personal impressions of this?

[Vagris] The meeting was businesslike and interesting and with goodwill and a party, comradely nature. We reviewed virtually the entire sphere of problems in perestroyka in the Baltic republics and we united in the main thing, namely, that the goal of all our efforts is to strengthen the USSR, fill our federation with new content on the basis of the Leninist principles of federalism, insure economic independence for the republics, and renew the status of the union republic communist parties as part of the CPSU. This, perhaps, is the main thing. And I would once again emphasize the common resolve to defend perestroyka against attacks on it from both conservative and leftist-radical positions.

Latvian Workers Union Position Outlined

18001616 Moscow TRUD in Russian
12 Sep 89 p 1

[Article by V. Knyazev: "No, Not Competitors But Allies"]

[Text] Riga—These days the appeal of the presidium of the republic trade union council to the republic government has attracted the attention of many residents of Latvia. It notes in particular that the standard of living of the population has dropped recently in Latvia, especially of the lower-paid segments of society. One of the reasons for this under the conditions of inflation and the increased shortage of goods is the rise in retail prices everywhere.

Industry has not overcome a tendency toward erosion of the inexpensive assortment of consumer goods or their production at higher prices. The rate of output in value terms exceeds the rate of production in physical units. And the changeover of the enterprises and organizations of the system of the Latvian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Ministry of Consumer services to complete economic accountability and self-financing has led in practice to an all-around increase in the rates for the most widely used consumer services without any improvement in the quality of service and also, as a rule, without taking the social composition of the population into account. With the agreement of the Latvian SSR

Council of Ministers a number of measures have been taken to raise prices in public catering. And this is happening without the position of the trade unions or public opinion being taken into account.

The presidium of the republic trade union council announced that the increase in prices and rates without compensatory measures undercuts the programs for raising the standard of living of the people and insistently demanded that the republic government hold the leaders of ministries and departments that have allowed a direct increase in prices and rates strictly accountable and that it immediately abolish the higher retail prices for goods and rates for services that were established in violation of existing legislation.

Residents of Latvia were satisfied with this trade union demand and hope that the government will respond to it properly.

The constituent congress of the Latvian workers' union held recently in the republic evoked ambivalent judgments. On Sunday on the program central television program Vremya the subject was the constituent congress of the Latvian workers' union and the establishment of some new "independent" trade union was also announced. Yesterday the TRUD editorial offices received telephone calls from various parts of the country, questions were asked, and doubts were expressed concerning this.

"So has some kind of alternative to existing trade union organizations really been established in Latvia?" At the end of the congress I asked this of A. Draudze, and electrical assembly worker at the Riga railroad car construction plant who had been elected as one of the cochairmen of the union.

"No, we do not intend to make enemies of any trade union or to take over their power," said Arvid Yanovich. "Our task is to enliven the existing trade unions and we have no intention of leaving them."

And here is what the secretary of the Latvian republic trade union council, Ya. Nesaule, had to say about this:

"Let us turn to the regulations of the Latvian workers' union. In the first point it says: The Latvian workers union is an independent interoccupational union of workers of the republic created on the initiative of the workers for the protection of their rights and the improvement of the position of workers in the society. I do not think any of the members of the new organization intends to leave the trade union and this is not required by the program documents of the workers' union. Moreover, since the time the union originated we have supported it, we helped in the organization of the congress, we participated in its work, and we suggested a program of joint actions. In particular now, during the period of the report and election campaign, we recommend placing active workers from the union on the trade union committees. Or we suggest, for example, getting involved in drawing up the collective agreement and, if necessary, putting forth alternative variants.

"Incidentally, much of what the union is including in its demands has been resolved or is in the process of resolution," Yanis Erikovich continued. "And today the republic trade unions are working according to a principally new program. Really the main thing for us now is the protection of the rights and interests of the workers, and many secondary issues which merely impeded our work have fallen away. But the problem is that there is a large shortage of information about what the trade unions are doing today. And the speakers at the constituent congress confirmed this once again. There was a demand to give the collective the right to dispose of its own fund for social, cultural, and domestic purposes. But this right had been given to them long ago. It is our fault that the workers today do not know their rights. We are learning our lessons. We hope that our new trade union newspaper ARODS will help to eliminate this shortage of information in the local organizations. The Latvian trade union council will continue in the future to support initiatives and undertakings of workers that are directed toward acceleration of perestroyka and increased effectiveness of their participation in the management of the affairs of the collective and the protection of the rights and social and economic interests of the workers.

I must add that the decisions of the AUCCTU [All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions] plenum held last weak concerning the urgent tasks of the trade unions earmarked a sharp turnabout in all trade union activity for increasing the protection of the legitimate interests of the workers. But many participants in the congress of the Latvian workers' union admitted in their conversations that they only vaguely remember hearing about the AUCCTU plenum and were frankly surprised when I spoke about decisions made at the plenum. Of course the trade union workers had a share in the blame for this but the mass media, including television, must also take part of the blame. Just compare how much screen time has been devoted to the position of the trade unions regarding various subjects and how much to—the informal groups.

...Speaking at the constituent congress, Ya. Nesaule, on behalf of the republic trade union council, said: "We have nothing to divide up with you. We have the same goals and tasks. So let us resolve them through joint efforts." A. Dambis, a USSR people's deputy from the trade unions, and the leader of a pipe layer brigade of the Latinzhstroymechanizatsiya Trust, who was sitting next to me, said with alarm: "The strangest thing is that a schism is appearing among us workers. Today problems cannot be solved by groups or groupings. Our strength lies in unity."

One cannot but agree with this.

Lithuanian Supreme Soviet Resumes Session

LD2909030689 Vilnius in English to North America 2300 GMT 28 Sep 89

[Text] We begin with a commentary by Edvinas Butkus on the work of the current session of Lithuanian parliament. Here is (Linos Benita) to read the text.

[(Benita)] Today after a 4 days' break the session of Lithuania's Supreme Soviet resumed its work. Two items of the session's agenda were considered: the referendum bill, as well as the bill on elections to Lithuania's Supreme Soviet and possible constitutional amendments connected with it. The debates lasted all day and no time was left to pass any significant resolutions. But it's more than likely that the referendum law will after all be adopted tomorrow. This seems to depend mostly on whether the editorial board, which is to prepare the final version of the referendum bill, will do a good job in the short span between tonight and tomorrow morning. Lithuania would then be the first among the constituent republics of the Soviet Union to have a referendum law.

Member of Parliament (Alfonsas Bernotas), chairman of the permanent parliamentary commission on bill ideas, who reported on the issue, pointed out that the acting constitutions of the Soviet Union and Lithuania had for more than a decade been only declaring this very significant attribute of direct democracy—namely referendums. The bill under discussion was published in the Lithuanian press at the end of June and it aroused great public interest. The proposals submitted had been taken into consideration while getting ready for this session. Besides, the deputies themselves had a lot of improvements to suggest.

One of the more important suggestions made would largely complicate any decision taking by means of referendum, for that would be a really democratic decision expressing the will of the people. The point is that, according to the former draft, the decision would come into force if it were supported by 25 per cent plus one of the registered voters; while the latest version stipulates that the percentage must be 50 plus one. These are purely technical, though most important, details of the referendum itself, but it was not they that raised controversy.

One of the Sajudis leaders, Member of Parliament Romualdas Ozolas, who had withdrawn his candidature from the proposed editorial board before that, summed up the most important obstacles. The point is that the adoption of the law on citizenship had been postponed so the citizen concept is undefined and must be replaced by a roundabout definition. Besides, other essential suggestions have been made. Hence, Romualdas Ozolas said, the referendum law must be further discussed, together with the law on citizenship and they should be both adopted at the next session at the beginning of October.

Secretary of the Supreme Soviet, (Dongan Eishetuti), who chaired the sitting, commissioned the editorial board to look into Romualdas Ozolas proposal and produce a conclusion tomorrow. Well at that moment Romualdas Ozolas must have regretted he had withdrawn his candidature from the editorial board.

True, towards the end of today's sittings the proposal that more deputies who had contributed to drafting the referendum law should be included in the editorial board was put to the vote. The negative decision, however, must have been determined by the domination of conservative views by the end of the day.

A report on the second item today, which is the sixth item on the session's agenda, was made by Vanda Klikuniene, deputy chairman of the Supreme Soviet Presidium. The report concerned the draft law on elections to the Supreme Soviet prolonging the mandates of the deputies to the local soviets, constitutional amendments and extensions connected with improving the election system, the structure of the bodies of state power and government, as well as the court system.

So what did Vice President Vanda Klikuniene say, voicing mostly the opinion of the Supreme Soviet Presidium? That the elections to the Supreme Soviet should be held in February next year, when the term of the current Supreme Soviet expires.

As is known, Sajudis members of parliament and part of the electorate come out for bringing forward the elections by one month at least so that there would be no break in the parliament's work.

In the opinion of the presidium the elections to the local soviets should be held only after the elections to the Supreme Soviet, around June, having prolonged the mandate of the present local soviets.

In her report Vanda Klikuniene dismissed one by one the constitutional amendments earlier proposed by the deputies.

Speaking at the session today were also Members of Parliament Vytautas Landsbergis, the Sajudis leader, and Algirdas Brazauskas, Lithuania's Communist Party leader. They touched upon the same issues mostly, but employing diametrically opposed arguments. In a word the Sajudis chairman called for introducing amendments to the constitution as soon as possible, while the Communist Party leader Algirdas Brazauskas urged a stop (?playing) with amendments to the acting constitution but devote all attention to the future new one.

Vilnius 'Protest March' Marks Pact Anniversary

LD2909014789 Vilnius in English to North America 2300 GMT 28 Sep 89

[Excerpts] I am Zigmas Banys, reporting for Radio Vilnius today. Fifty years ago two dictators, Hitler and Stalin, decided to divide Eastern Europe into the zones of their influence. Their decision subsequently resulted in the elimination of Poland's, Latvia's, Estonia's, and

Lithuania's independence. [Passage omitted on the Ribbentrop-Molotov nonaggression pact]

On this Thursday, which was the 28th September, the Lithuanian nation marked the 50th anniversary of the notorious German-Soviet deal. In this connection the alliance of all political forces of Lithuania, including the Lithuanian reform movement Sajudis, who demand that Moscow issue an official admission of the illegality of the above mentioned documents, staged a huge protest march along Gediminas Avenue in Vilnius.

The march started at the historical place where the leaders of a joint Polish-Lithuanian uprisal against the oppression of Russian tsarism in 1863 were publicly executed.

Taking part in the solemn march were thousands and thousands of people. The march was led by the leaders of the Lithuanian Liberty League and the Democrat Party. The march ended at Gediminas Square, where about 10,000 people gathered. This gathering was also timed to coincide with the conclusion of a hunger strike which was held in protest of Lithuanian occupation and annexation by the Soviet Union.

One of the leaders of the Democrat Party (Dagras Petulunas) told the meeting that thousands of Lithuanian patriots lost their lives in an effort to save freedom for Lithuania.

Speaking at the meeting the leader of the Lithuanian Liberty League Antanas Terlackas, said that the nation should respect its dead fighters for liberty. The spokesman for the Lithuanian Liberty League (Leonardus Vilkas) read an open letter to the charge d'affaires of the Lithuanian diplomatic service in Washington and Lithuania's plenipotentiary in the Vatican (Stasys Lavrietis).

The meeting came to an end but the people stayed to attend the Holy mass at the Vilnius cathedral.

Lithuanian Leader 'Hopeful' After Moscow

PM2809131589 Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian 17 Sep 89 p 1

[Reprint of 16 September TIESA report on 15 September Lithuanian Radio interview with Algirdas Brazauskas, first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee: "We Are Not Changing Position—We Are Preparing for the Congress"—first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] On Friday Algirdas Brazauskas, first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee, gave his traditional interview to Lithuanian Radio. We publish an abbreviated stenographic record of the conversation.

[Question] The central press has not yet published, as it had promised, reports on the meeting between the leaders of the Baltic republics (a report was received and printed in Saturday's SOVETSKAYA LITVA—editor's note) with three CPSU Central Committee Politburo members, including M.S. Gorbachev.

[Answer] The meeting was interesting. The discussion lasted a long time—more than 4 hours.

[Question] Was it devoted purely to the Baltic?

[Answer] Yes, just the Baltic. We talked about the work and problems facing us every day. In general terms, it could be said that three issues are the most topical and important for both us and the CPSU Central Committee Politburo. The first is to legalize the Soviet Union as a federal state. As I understand it, M.S. Gorbachev will be discussing this at length at the forthcoming plenum. We have also put this subject forward, stressing that the concepts of "independence" and "sovereignty" are very topical for the Baltic republics and the other Soviet republics. The concept of a new federation is probably one of the main questions for the entire state.

The second issue is the formation of a new concept of party organizations, of the CPSU, and I would even say of the preparations for the 28th Congress. This preparatory work should be begun without any prompting. The discussion of the status of the Lithuanian Communist Party is obviously the most difficult issue today. The concept of CPSU unity has been invariable for 70 years now. The spring 1919 Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks) Congress adopted corresponding decisions, but at that time there was no Soviet Union, republics, or parties in those republics, and now there should be quite a different concept, even relying on the concept of the state structure.

This issue is particularly difficult for us, because we are the first. We will have to give it further close study, and we are now discussing it extensively in preparing the Lithuanian Communist Party Statutes and Program. We are grateful to all party organizations and committees for this activeness. We hope that, just through common efforts and by getting around a common table, we can prepare draft Statutes and Programs which will be optimum versions, understood by all. In no circumstances should there be contradictory drafts or a dilemma over which one to choose. The world "alternative" has become very popular in our life, but in this case it was quite unnecessary. Work should be carried out before the congress.

[Question] Does this mean that you yet again advocated united progress rather than division and opposition?

[Answer] Yes, we should be united, particularly in resolving party matters. We very much want to prevent the Lithuanian Communist Party, or our territory, from being split. If this happens, the strengths of each group will be weakened. And we will hardly be able to achieve results which would be useful for our republic and our party.

[Question] What was the third subject discussed in Moscow?

[Answer] The third subject was the equality of all people. Today conflicts of an ethnic nature are occurring in our Baltic region, just as in other parts of the Soviet Union, and laws or decisions are being adopted which discriminate against certain groups of people. The cultured and civilized world devotes a very great deal of attention to equality among people and to enshrining equal rights in law.

[Question] The past 2 weeks have been a period of particularly concentrated attention on us. One now senses that this attention is diminishing, and I link this to Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's calm, wise, and objective views.

[Answer] Speaking at the meeting, I said that life in Lithuania is normal; political life, of course, is seething. And we should support it and seek ways and means to resolve economic matters—this is our main task. I stressed in the discussion—and my colleagues supported me—that the plan for economic autonomy should be adopted without fail.

[Question] How was your position greeted?

[Answer] Positively. It was supported by the other Politburo members attending too.

[Question] And what about the tone of the discussion?

[Answer] The tone was amicable. We came away hopeful. Comrade M.S. Gorbachev said that he supports our sensible and fine steps consolidating all the republic's forces, that he trusts us, and that he would like to go on trusting us in the future.

However, bitter words, doubts, and complaints were also expressed. These are perhaps the distinctive features of our haste on the path of perestroyka.

[Question] What was said? What were the first words when you met with your close colleagues here at the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee yesterday morning?

[Answer] First, I said that we are obliged to adhere to the line which we have followed hitherto, and we are not changing our position. The main question is how to maintain the line of political and economic life and how to prepare for the party congress. We do not yet have a date for it, we will determine this at our next plenum. We will also determine the norms for representation. We do not agree that it should be some kind of huge rally with several thousand Communists taking part. It is very hard to adopt well-conceived decisions at the kind of huge forums which some people are proposing. There has never been an event like it in the history of the Lithuanian Communist Party. That is why we need to prepare documents and discuss them in a very responsible and very well-conceived way.

[Question] What should we all do now?

[Answer] Primarily, take a serious and tolerant attitude to each other. The CPSU Central Committee plenum will be held next week. I would very much like certain forces to stop trying to identify some of their interests, statements, or attacks with the plenum. We need party organizations to consolidate. Although we have a plurality of opinions, there are norms of party discipline, duty, and responsibility, and these norms should be adhered to.

Baltic Newsmen Protest Media Disinformation

PM2909103789 Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian 7 Sep 89 pp 1, 3

["Statement by the Lithuanian Union of Journalists Secretariat"—SOVETSKAYA LITVA headline]

[Text] Now that the stagnant mechanism of our unitary state is disintegrating, each republic, oblast, and even city is witnessing its own, different perestroyka processes. Interethnic problems and questions of the future development of the federation have come to the fore, together with the economic indigence that has been laid bare. The Soviet peoples have rid themselves of the theory of "merger" and its consequences and are reviving their own languages and cultures and the right to unrestricted international cooperation.

Of course, economic, political, and ethnic perestroyka is not taking place in a sterile, rosy environment, with the complete "unanimity" of the stagnation era. Many people who have breathed for the first time the intoxicating air of democracy and glasnost imagine that they have already become serious politicians, make ill-judged words and actions and nationalist and chauvinist extremism their stock-in-trade, display a lack of respect for state and political institutions and certain representatives of the authorities, and so forth. All this happens in the Baltic republics, including Lithuania. We must regretfully state that there have been several acts of vandalism here. But it is not these phenomena that dictate the nature of perestroyka either in the country as a whole or in Lithuania. Unfortunately, pieces in many central publications over recent weeks and broadcasts by Central and Leningrad Television have given a topsy-turvy view of events in Lithuania. Items in the papers SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, PRAVDA, and KRASNAYA ZVEZDA and some television programs create the impression that that the Lithuanian people consist entirely of nationalists, extremists, and hysterical people who are just waiting for an opportunity to mislead the country's public, secede from the USSR, and infringe ethnic minorities' rights and who claim they are the only ones upholding Soviet power and socialism. Nina Andreyeva's favorite paper, SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, has published letters which render one speechless! They shamelessly plug the idea that, for example, people of Russian nationality, when expressing their views, are frightened to supply their names, because, they say, they have small children. What they mean is that the nationalists might wreak violence on these children. Some journalists have become such zealous supporters of human and minorities' rights that one gets the impression that there is no such thing as nations' rights. Although no one has actually proved that the former are being violated today. Except that some apologists of the "merger of nations" have been told to learn local languages.

Journalists are among the pioneers of and motive forces behind perestroyka. Many colleagues in the central press have been and remain a model for Lithuanian journalists in the struggle against Stalinism and stagnation. We respect the collective efforts of the editorial boards of KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, IZVESTIYA, TRUD, OGONEK, MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI, and the journal NOVYY MIR in their desire to analyze perestroyka in the Baltic republics more thoroughly. But many items in recent weeks have demonstrated that, following interference by the command system, the old methods have returned to the press: condemnation, stage-managed rallies, and so on. What one might call actions of hatred toward the Baltic republics have been held in Leningrad and Moscow and readers in Pyatigorsk or Magadan who have never been to Lithuania have fulminated against "Lithuanian nationalists" and "enemies of the people." The Lithuanian public and journalists in the republic were angered by the pieces by V. Dorofeyev (POLITICHESKOYE OBRAZOVANIYE), Yu. Yemelyanov and others (SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA), and G. Ovcharenko (PRAVDA). As a result of their creative imagination, the placards of certain extremists, of whom there are many in the squares and stadiums of Moscow as well, have become the essence of Lithuanian political life, while Belorussian school janitor S. Bulavko, holding the slogan "Down with the CPSU," as featured on the pages of the press, became a Lithuanian nationalist.

There was an adverse reaction in the press to the "Baltic Chain," in which around 1 million Baltic inhabitants participated. Would it not be better to ask why people participated voluntarily and earnestly in this action—not only Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians, but Russians, Poles, and members of other nationalities too. Yet all this is called "nationalist hysteria."

Some Moscow editorial offices are reverting to censorship and to ignoring writers' views. The Central Televison program "Vremya" is particularly good at this. Some republican leaders have been forced to make public statements about it.

One would like to draw the attention of journalist colleagues to the following fact. As is known, Leninism acknowledges nations' right to self-determination. The USSR Constitution maintains that our state is a voluntary union of sovereign republics, despite the fact that the Baltic republics were incorporated by force. The republics, as state entities, are granted the right to secede from the federation. So why does the discussion of these constitutional provisions give rise to such irritation and condemnation? Perhaps the USSR Constitution has already ceased to be valid? Perhaps some articles were formulated merely in order to mislead the public?

Esteemed colleagues, journalists of central publications, television, and radio! You were the heralds of perestroyka and only last year we were drawing on your resolve, selflessness, and ability to provide readers with objective information. And it is on you that the fate of perestroyka depends today.

Disinformation and violation of the ethics of journalism are one of the media's most disgraceful vices. The law that is being devised on the press ought to stipulate serious penalties for this. And we invite those journalists who are not rushing into the arms of the stagnation that is apparent in some places and who sincerely want to understand the processes taking place in Lithuania and all over the Baltic area to visit us and we will give them every hospitality.

'One-Sided' Debate in Lithuania Criticized

PM1909121589 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 6 Sep 89 Second Edition p 3

[Candidate of Historical Sciences Stanislava Yuonene article under the general heading "Parallel Dialogue": "'What Will Become of Us?'"]

[Text] I am a Lithuanian, and today I am unemployed. Even official circles from the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee apparatus will hardly be able to deny that my dismissal from the institute where I was teaching scientific communism was in essence a ban on my right to a profession. But this is not about me.

The Lithuanian people today are stifled by the unprecedented current propaganda about the possibility of being the first negatively charged particle capable of blowing up the Soviet Union. This idea is crazy and dangerous: Our union is bound to the world by very many threads, and wrecking the balance established among these ties would mean ruining the interests of the republic and the state and obstructing progress. "What awaits us tomorrow?"—this is not an idle question for Lithuania. Admittedly, **the entire truth** is not getting through to the Lithuanians in the republic. Today the "truth," brought to people by a mass of informal information which has rained down on Lithuania, is one-sided and distorted. The face of bourgeois Lithuania, which has been covered by the web of time, is being thoroughly cleaned up. It is rosy and handsome. The country's new history is being blackened.

"Leaving the Union"—today this idea is being passed off as the people's will even by senior party personnel. This, they say, is what every Lithuanian wants. Everyone? First, the cunning shown in introducing this idea into the consciousness of ordinary people should be recognized. At the beginning it was slipped in as something seditious, but—in the spirit of perestroyka. It was slipped in and people began exaggerating it from all sides, whipping it up, and making it out to be the only correct idea. And it—I can't deny it—took root to such a degree that the forces of "Sajudis" and various leagues and committees "for the liberation of Lithuania" are now saying: "This is what the people want." This has happened so many times—whoever has gotten their hands on power has done so with the people's help!...

Today almost all the republic's mass media are obsessed with the idea of leaving the Union: "It doesn't matter if you have to tighten your belt, the important thing is to be free." Extremist forces are making very skillful use of the reader's present perception that what is printed in typographic script is the truth. People are still unable to recognize this one-sided "pluralism," and everything is taken at face value. Basically all today's publications are in the same hands, and they are by no means the hands of the Lithuanian Communist Party. What is more, I dare say that there has been an ideological merger of the republic Central Committee apparatus, which does not have a stance, and "Sajudis," where the latter plays first violin. Is this not allowing the tail to wag the dog? The apparatus gives assurances that it is not being led along but is consolidating its forces. That seems to be a good idea—but consolidating with whom, I would like to ask? Is it not appropriate to recall Lenin here once more: Before consolidation, there has to be separation. We need to know with whom to unite.

In this connection I cannot remain silent about the "Declaration" being hotly discussed in the republic, which was signed on Gotland Island, and where the name of Yu. Paletskis, a senior Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee worker, is among the signatories. Where did the son of the socialist republic's first president place his name? Next to Terlyatskas, head of the "Lithuanian Freedom League," and Bobyalis head of the "Lithuanian Liberation Committee,"—and we know what their principles are. They do not conceal them. If these names had been at the bottom of a declaration to assist, say, sick children, who would have objected? But this is the sharp end of politics.

I repeat: What we have run into today in our republic is a consequence of the fact that the great mass of people are mentally unprepared for democratization and unable to work out their own position independently. This, of course, is the party's fault. And for this reason now the person who speaks loudest in our republic speaks on behalf of the people (and it is those who control the mass media who speak loudest). "Sajudis" "speaks on behalf of the people," as do the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee and all the leagues and committees. Although **the people** gave no such order to anyone. Some of the leaders even believe that all Lithuanians are against CPSU policy, its national platform, and its Statement on the Situation in the Baltic Republics. The whole people cannot think in the same way. Not even two people think identically. What is this if not the dogmatism drummed into the heads of people from time immemorial?

I am deeply convinced that the CPSU Central Committee Statement was overdue. Who is to blame? Obviously, such a statement should have come from the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee in the first place. Moscow could not wait for it. While it waited, time slipped by. Now responsibility for the situation has to be shared.

The situation had become desperate. The adoption of the Law on the State Language came at that point. Maybe it is a good thing to let the status of the main language be questioned. It is bad that the decree on language was adopted during an unwholesome uproar, following one-sided discussion, and in haste. This is the reason for the feeling of insult among the republic's foreign-speaking population, who saw this as an infringement of their rights. Does the republic today hear the voice of the minority—that voice about which our representatives at the Congress of USSR People's Deputies were so concerned? It was taken care of in Moscow, but it was forgotten here at home.

Government Commission on Chernobyl Continues Work

LD2809231189 Moscow TASS in English 2221 GMT 28 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow September 28 TASS—Health protection measures in the areas contaminated as a result of the Chernobyl nuclear power plant accident dominated the meetings of the government commission set up to eliminate the consequences of the Chernobyl accident, held during its visit to the Gomel and Mogilev regions of Soviet Belorussia, the Zhitomir and Kiev regions of the Soviet Ukraine and the Bryansk region of the Russian Federation from July 26 to September 13.

The commission headed by Soviet Deputy Prime Minister Vitaliy Doguzhiev concluded that individual radiation doses did not exceed the permissible level in the years 1986-1988 and are expected to be much lower than the permissible norm in 1989.

The commission also pointed out some shortcomings, such as lack of medical personnel in contaminated areas and insufficient analysis of the causes of growth of some general diseases. There are irregularities in the supply of foods and consumer goods brought from other areas. The commission has issued special instructions on these matters.

The commission also discussed preparations for resettling residents from those populated localities where the radiation level is still harmful for health.

Having discussed questions of reliable operation of the Chernobyl nuclear power plant, including control over the safety of the entombment over the stricken reactor, the commission instructed the union ministries and the Ukrainian Council of Ministers to continue works in the 30-kilometer zone, mainly to prevent the contamination of environment. The commission also considered the state of construction works in the town of Slavutich.

In the end of August of 1989, the commission received a draft of the Belorussian state programme to eliminate the consequences of the Chernobyl accident in the years 1990-1995. It provides for additional health protection measures and improvement of the life of people living in "contaminated" areas and also for resettlement of residents from some populated localities.

Similar programmes will be submitted to the government commission by the Ukraine and the Russian Federation before October 10.

The commission is now considering the proposals of the Councils of Ministers of the Russian Federation, Belorussia and the Ukraine on granting additional benefits to residents in some regions. The commission will consider this issue at its meeting on October 5 and will pass over its proposals to the Soviet Government.

Gumbaridze Discusses Georgian Draftees With Lizichev

PM2809084589 Tbilisi ZARYA VOSTOKA in Russian 15 Sep 89 p 1

[GRUZINFORM report: "To Restore Good Traditions of Collaboration"]

[Text] G. Gumbaridze, first secretary of the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee, has received Army General A. Lizichev, chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate, who is visiting the republic.

Note was taken during the conversation of the need to restore and strengthen the ties and good traditions of contacts and collaboration between army Communists and the republic's party organizations. A special role here must be played by the mass media. It is necessary to give the population better information about the life and deeds of army collectives serving in Transcaucasus Military District units and subunits, whose personnel are keenly interested in the republic's life, the successes and difficulties emerging in the course of perestroyka, and the specific work on its implementation. It is desirable for students, school pupils, and representatives of the creative intelligentsia and labor collectives from Georgia's cities and rayons to pay more frequent visits to military units and establish mutual contacts.

Serious concern was expressed in connection with the increasing frequency of recent cases involving death of servicemen drafted from the republic, which makes it necessary to impose proper order and strengthen discipline in the forces, especially in military construction units. Lizichev promised to investigate all these questions and to take specific measures.

A wish was expressed during the meeting that more draftees from Georgia should serve on the republic's territory.

It was noted with satisfaction that, by decision of the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau, military units which have on their strength teenagers from the Georgian Soviet Socialist Republic are being visited by delegations from the republic's cities and rayons to establish permanent military-sponsorship ties, which will certainly help to improve the military-patriotic and international education not only of draftees from Georgia but also of all the personnel of the military subunits in which they perform their compulsory military service.

Taking part in the meeting were N. Chitanava and A. Pavshentsev; O. Gonadze, chief of the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee State and Legal Department; Colonel General V. Patrikeyev, commander of the Transcaucasus Military District; Lieutenant General A. Ovchinnikov, member of the Military Council and chief of the Southern Zone Political Directorate; and Lieutenant General A. Novikov, member of the Military Council and chief of the Transcaucasus Military District Political Directorate.

Soviet Leaders 'Misled' on Blockade's End

NC2809143589 Yerevan International Service in Armenian 1900 GMT 27 Sep 89

[Sergey Kasyan Commentary]

[Text] For the last two months or so, freight sent by rail through Azerbaijan has not entered our republic. It is difficult to believe, yet the fact is that in the annals of Soviet statehood an unprecedented phenomenon is being documented: The economic blockade of a republic by a neighboring republic. This has occurred as we face the winter, with various building materials needed to restore the disaster zone and prefabricated houses required for the hundreds of thousands of homeless victims and refugees. Industrial machinery, raw materials, and various vital commodities such as food are being depleted daily.

As Suren Arutunyan, first secretary of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee, said at the recent CPSU plenum, our republic's sole lifeline is the railway passing through Georgia. However, the capacity of that railway is limited.

It is strange but true that the central press and television until recently consigned to silence the blockade of an entire republic. The situation is even worse in Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO], which has been under blockade almost for the past 1 and ½ years. Yes, we could certainly state today that all this is being done by the internationalist leadership of the so- called fraternal Azerbaijan in order to exert pressure on the NKAO problem.

In his speech to the second session of the USSR Supreme Soviet which convened two days ago, [25 September] Mikhail Gorbachev, the leader of the country, referred to the economic blockade of Armenia and declared that the trains had already started moving the night before. It soon became obvious that the Soviet leaders have been misled by the Azerbaijan leaders. Yesterday, Moscow central television again aired an interview with the deputy chairman of the Azerbaijan railway branch. He was trying to convince television viewers that the rails have been opened and that trains loaded with building materials, food, and other commodities are entering Armenia regularly. Soon after that the television viewers saw the report from Yerevan.

Yes, trains had arrived in Armenia. But of what did the freight consist? Completely rotten food, gravel, sand, and other freight of secondary importance. In its turn, today's PRAVDA has reported that rail cars loaded with considerable amounts of building materials, equipment, and prefabricated houses have been dispatched to Armenia. We saw the trains which arrived in Armenia and their contents and spoke with the leadership and functionaries at the Yerevan railway branch. We only heard indignation and rage in reply to the pharisaical statements of the Azerbaijan leadership.

The second session of the USSR Supreme Soviet continues, and the Armenian people expect that the culprits behind the blockade of Armenia will receive the deserved [word indistinct] from the people's deputies and that strong measures will be taken to eliminate this unprecedented phenomenon in the Soviet Union.

Azerbaijan Panels on Interethnic Relations Meet

PM2509094389 Baku BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY in Russian 2 Sep 89 p 2

[AZERINFORM report: "Commissions at Work"]

[Excerpts] A joint sitting of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee Commission on Interethnic Relations and the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet Commission on Interethnic Relations and International Education was held 30 August under the chairmanship of A.F. Dashdamirov.

The sitting was devoted to discussing the draft CPSU platform "The Nationalities Policy of the Party in Present-Day Conditions." Scientists, specialists, and representatives of social organizations and the creative intelligentsia took part in the discussion.

The sitting noted that the draft platform submitted for nationwide discussion is an important step on the way to broadening democratization processes in the sphere of national relations and guaranteeing the equal, harmonious development of all nations and ethnic groups in the USSR. [passage omitted]

Underlining the enormous importance for the fate of perestroyka and the future of the first-ever socialist, multinational state of drawing up a correct nationalities policy consonant with the spirit of the times and the fundamental interests of all peoples living in the USSR, the participants in the sitting focused attention on those provisions of the draft platform which require elaboration, clarification, concretization, and additions. Particular attention was devoted to the mechanism proposed in the draft for examining disputes between a union republic and autonomous region at the Congress of USSR People's Deputies. This provision was considered unconstitutional and at variance with the sovereign rights of those union republics which have autonomous regions in their territory. Constitutional legislation does not give the USSR the right to deal directly with autonomous regions, bypassing the union republics. All questions concerning autonomous regions are decided at union republic level. The principles of subordinate relations in a union state enshrined in the Treaty on the Formation of the USSR must be politically and legally developed and consolidated in the present-day nationalities policy of the party and the state.

That is the stand taken by the commission on this fundamentally important issue, which reflects the opinion of the public throughout the republic.

The reference to the so-called Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] problem in the same breath as that of the peoples who suffered from Stalin's tyranny arouses categorical objection and bewilderment. This approach conflicts with the historical truth and the political assessment of the events in Nagorno-Karabakh contained in the material of the sitting and the decision taken by the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium on 18 July 1988. Justice demands that this list include the Azerbaijani people living outside the Azerbaijan SSR who were also the victims of repressions at one time. Information about this is contained in the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium Decree of 20 May 1968 on restoring political rights to peoples who were victims.

Specific proposals concerning questions of improving interethnic relations on the basis of public opinion in the republic will be sent to the CPSU Central Committee.

Opinions were then exchanged on the situation in the republic, the attention of law enforcement organs was drawn to the need to strengthen law and order and the rule of law, stop the actions of extremist elements, and intensify measures ensuring the safety of Azerbaijanis in the NKAO and regions bordering the Armenian SSR, and ideas were expressed on restoring the constitutional rule of the Azerbaijan SSR in the NKAO.

Information was heard from the chairman of the sitting on progress in preparing for discussion of the situation in the NKAO at the forthcoming session of the Azerbaijan SSR Supreme Soviet. It was noted that legislative proposals designed to strengthen the sovereignty of the Azerbaijan SSR in territorial-political questions and questions concerning the national-state structure of our republic are almost complete. [passage omitted]

Kirghiz Supreme Soviet Discusses Law on Languages

LD2309192289 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 23 Sep 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast report over video by V. Fedorov]

[Text] [Fedorov] [Video shows Kirghiz Supreme Soviet in session] This was an extraordinary session; life demanded that consideration of a number of key issues of democratization and relations between nationalities should be speeded up. Draft laws on amendments and addenda to the constitution of the Kirghiz Soviet Socialist Republic, on elections of people's deputies of the Kirghiz SSR and local soviets, and also a draft law on the state language of the Kirghiz SSR are being discussed. All these were published a month ago and put forward for discussion by the people.

The approval of the majority was given to provisions of the draft law on elections which cut short the sad experience of neglecting public opinion, offer an opportunity of proposing any number of candidates, and annul the constituency preelection meetings and the election of deputies from public organizations. All deputies will be elected on common bases. Glasnost at all stages of the election campaign is legislatively guaranteed. The draft law on the state language, however, gave rise to an equivocal and very emotional reaction. Many petitions with thousands of signatures have been (?handed in to the) republican Supreme Soviet.

[Begin recording of A.A. Akayev, president of the Kirghiz SSR Academy of Sciences, USSR people's deputy] Further work has already been done today on drawing up a draft law on the state language, taking account of opinions expressed by working people of the republic. The draft is wholly in accord with the thesis on the development of national languages and on attributing the status of state languages to the indigenous nationalities of the union republics, which was formulated by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev in his report at the last plenum of the CPSU Central Committee. This convinces us once again that we are on the true path, and the law on the state language of Kirghiz SSR, which we will adopt today, will help strengthen our socialist federation, strengthen friendship between the peoples of our country, and promote development and mutual enrichment of cultures between our peoples. [end recording]

Gas Explosion Near Ordzhonikidze Reported

PM2109141189 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 21 Sep 89 Single Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Accident on Gas Pipeline"]

[Text] Ordzhonikidze, 20 Sep—During the night a powerful explosion woke up the inhabitants of the capital of North Osetiya and the nearby Prigorodnyy Rayon settlements of Kambileyevskoye, Sunzha, and Kurtat. A mighty column of fire shot up toward the sky on the 82d kilometer of the North Caucasus-Transcaucasus main gas pipeline through which gas from West Siberia is conveyed to Georgia, Armenia, and Azerbaijan.

There was no loss of life, the accident happened in the steppe. Crops and forest plantation are affected.

The compressor station at Mozdok was immediately shut down, and valves on the pipeline at the Olginskoye and Chermen settlements were closed. Rescue teams have embarked on eliminating the cause of the malfunction.

Leaders of North Osetian party and economic organs have visited the site of the accident on the main gas pipeline.

The causes of the accident are currently being investigated by a special technical commission, Yu. Karayev, chief of the "Sevosgaz" administration told a TASS correspondent. So far one thing is clear: A 1,200 mm pipe has been ruptured. And what is more, the rupture did not occur on a seam but in the middle of the pipe. This means substandard work at the factory stage.

Supplies of fuel to the Transcaucasus will be somewhat reduced since the gas is being supplied along a reserve pipeline which is smaller in diameter. The situation will return to normal within the next few days.

State Gas Concern 'Gazprom' Created

18220213 Moscow GAZOVAYA PROMYSHLENNOST in Russian No 9, Sep 89 pp 2-4

[Article by Ye.K. Selikhova: "The 'Gazprom' Concern, An Independent Economic Complex"]

[Text] The creation of the state gas concern Gazprom marks a principally new stage in the democratization of the management of the gas industry.

The highest management organ is the concern's council which includes the leaders of associations, enterprises, and organizations as well as the chairman of the councils of their labor collectives.

The concern council will solve problems having to do with the branch's future development, strategic tasks of scientific and technical progress, intensification of production, the implementation of an effective investment and resource-saving policy, expansion and deepening of commercial-economic and scientific-technical cooperation with foreign countries, and further improvement of the economic mechanism and management structure. Of course comprehensive development of the social sphere is still a subject of special concern. This includes improvement of housing and cultural-domestic conditions of the workers of the branch, the output of consumer goods, and conversion of populated points to gas, especially in rural areas.

Being the highest organ of the concern, the council will provide leadership through the board and its working apparatus. At the first meeting of the council they elected a chairman, V.S. Chernomyrdin, and a board consisting of 14 people. The council will determine the composition and size of the working staff, the conditions and system of wages of the board and working staff, and expenditures on their maintenance.

The board will carry out preliminary development of all issues considered by the council. In particular it organizes the development of long-range and current plans and leadership of their implementation; it informs the enterprises of the economic normatives and the policy for distributing profit; and it forms and utilizes centralized funds and reserves. Now the fate of the branch as a whole and of each of its workers will depend on the leaders of associations and enterprises and the chairman of councils of labor collectives, on their skillful and creative work, collective reason, wisdom, and farsightedness.

The formation of the concern was dictated by the further strengthening and development of economic accountability in the gas industry. We were convinced of this by the results of the activity of the associations and enterprises under the new management conditions and also the problems that began to arise when carrying out branch tasks for providing for reliable operation of the USSR YeSG [Integrated Gas Supply System]. A certain role was also played by the attentive study of the experience of foreign countries (FRG, England, Italy, France, Japan) which have similar organizational structures.

As we know, the gas industry is an integrated technological and production structure which includes facilities for extraction, processing, and transportation of gas with auxiliary services. The country's integrated gas supply system has been purposefully created over decades. Reliable provision of gas for the national economy is achieved as a result of efficient, smooth interaction of all units of this system and control of these from an integrated center, which is especially important in connection with the extremely irregular consumption of gas in the various seasons.

The creation of the concern in the gas industry was an insistent necessity dictated by the economic reform, the special conditions of the operation of the branch, and also the accumulated experience in the introduction of economic accountability and self-financing.

The creation of a concern with centralized financing is mutually advantageous for all the associations and enterprises included in it. And their rights are not reduced at all—on the contrary, broad possibilities are opened up for more complete accounting for their interests with economic accountability.

As we know, the economies of gas extraction enterprises are formed largely under the influence of natural factors and depend on changes in mining and geological conditions. With the depletion of gas supplies profit decreases and fixed production capital increases. As the deposits are worked, the profitability of the enterprises decreases and they are not able to independently cover their own expenses and settle accounts with the budget. At the same time they accumulate large amortization deductions for the renovation of fixed capital, which cannot be used because of the lack of sufficient gas resources in the given region. At the same time enterprises that are assimilating large new deposits and have high profitability levels and are not experiencing any difficulties in settling accounts with the budget do not have sufficient capital for further development. And this is understandable since they are just beginning their activity and so far have small amounts of fixed capital and amortization deductions. The concern makes it possible to concentrate this capital, to use it in the interests of all participants, and to settle accounts with the budget.

This is the only way it is possible to solve the complex problems related to the changeover to taxation of profit under the next five-year plan. Calculations show that of the 306 independent enterprises only 53 will be able to pay taxes from profit in the projected amounts because of mining-geological conditions and their high capital-intensiveness. The concern will be able to guarantee the payment of taxes to the state.

The economic interrelations between the concern and the enterprises included in it will be arranged on a mutually advantageous basis. Here one should take into account that the concern includes two groups of associations, enterprises, and organizations.

The first includes those which directly provide for the work of the USSR YeSG and participate in the technological cycle of extraction, processing, transportation, and storage of gas. They are included in the concern by a decision of the government and retain their economic independence, and their economic interests are in no way encroached upon.

According to established normatives these enterprise from funds for material incentives and social development from their profit, make deductions into the local budget, and allot the fund for the development of production in the necessary amount. The remaining profit and amortization deductions up to the point of complete restoration are accumulated in the concern for accounts with the union budget, the financing of centralized capital investments, compensating enterprises with declining incomes when there is a change in mining and geological conditions and the demand for gas, rendering financial assistance, and other needs.

Enterprises included directly in the USSR YeSG have the responsibility for fulfillment of plans for production and capital construction and the reliability of the technological process with minimum expenditure of funds. They will operate according to the law on the state enterprise (association) taking into account the peculiarities of the USSR YeSG.

The second group includes associations, enterprises, and organizations that do scientific research, planning-design, construction, repair, adjustment, and other jobs and services for the USSR Integrated Gas Supply System and also associations that provide for the entire cycle of extraction and transportation of gas in the local regions.

Enterprises of this group are included in the concern on a voluntary basis and have the right to resign from it whenever they wish. Production and financial interrelations between them and the concern are determined in a contract (agreement) which is concluded, as a rule, for 5 years.

In order to strengthen the role of credit and accounting relations, to utilize monetary funds more efficiently, to finance special programs, and also to settle accounts with the state budget and fulfill economic commitments to the associations, enterprises, and organizations included in it, the concern is organizing a commercial bank.

It seems expedient to introduce the new financial interrelations in the concern and accounts with the budget beginning in 1990 and to retain the existing policy for accounts, reporting, and accountability until the end of this year. On instructions from the concern council the working apparatus in conjunction with economic services of associations and enterprises before November of this year must consider the economic normatives in detail and also the financial positions of all associations and enterprises included in it and prepare for the council's approval the basic economic indicators and the procedure for financial accounts.

Working in the concern and taking advantage of the rights and broad possibilities opened up by the new management system, we have every opportunity to use economic levers and incentives more fully and to work more effectively.

Aide Defends Yeltsin Conduct on U.S. Trip

PM2809121589 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 27 Sep 89 p 3

[P. Voshchanov article under the rubric "Apropos of Parliamentary Debate": "Yeltsin in America. Chronicle of a Tour and Associated Events"]

[Text] Generally speaking, this tour was in itself unusual. A Soviet politician traveling to the United States not on official business but as a private individual. The reason? He was invited by several U.S. universities, some of the largest charitable foundations, and leading politicians and journalists. Some of us used annual leave for this trip. Our delegation comprised all sorts of people: USSR People's Deputy Viktor Yaroshenko, Yeltsin's aide Lev Sukhanov, and Gennadiy Alferenko, chairman of the USSR Social Inventions Foundation Board.

So what happened to B. Yeltsin and our delegation in America? How is one to treat the "revealing" reports by some foreign publications which appeared with amazing speed in the pages of our newspapers? For the time being, I shall refrain from passing my own judgment in this matter, since the emotional effect of events has yet to yield to a sober and considered evaluation. Therefore, today I shall narrate only what I consider to be indisputable facts, recorded in the diary of our visit which I kept from its beginning to its end.

USSR People's Deputy B. Yeltsin, member of the country's Supreme Soviet, took off for New York 9 September 1989. We stood in the ordinary check-in line, deflecting onslaughts by Western journalists who had come to the airport. Fortunately, when the customs officers and border guards recognized Yeltsin they did their best to speed up the processing of our documents and baggage.

Nonetheless, the entire flight to New York ended up being a nonstop news conference. Passengers, flight attendants, and the aircraft's pilots steadily streamed to Yeltsin's seat for a chat. Eventually, time was found for a conversation with the members of the delegation. It unexpectedly took a rather "sharp" turn: Who told Radio Liberty something about speaking fees? "No fees! This must be announced right at the airport." We found it hard to persuade him to abandon this plan: Speaking fees are the custom in America. Furthermore, this would help the delegation to operate on the basis of self-financing, and thus retain its "economic independence." "Fine. But we must think of a use to which we can put this money."

Our first conversation with the U.S. partners in New York opened with a discussion of this question. Yeltsin insisted that they take on an additional commitment: To find a firm in America which would be able speedily to deliver to the USSR a fairly large shipment of disposable syringes. Naturally, the financial aspect of the tour was also discussed. It was agreed that it should be as follows: Every speech, regardless of the size of the audience and the cost of tickets sold, should be valued at $25,000—this is the current fee in the United States. But 30 percent of this amount was to be retained by the tour organizers as payment for their brokerage services. This is also a customary U.S. practice. The remainder would be used to cover all expenses associated with the Soviet delegation's stay—hotels, food, transportation, telephone calls. Only the amount remaining after that could be disposed of by Yeltsin at his own discretion. Let me say this: That was the first and only discussion of the tour's financial conditions. The question was never raised again.

I don't know about Yeltsin, but I remember the 1st day we spent in New York as an absolute nightmare. We hardly managed to make it from one meeting to the other. This work schedule did not even leave any time to make the traditional tour of the city. It was just as well that Bob Schwartz, one of the heads of the "Esalen" Institute, which organized our tour of America, offered us a helicopter tour. A 30-minute flight, then we were again rushing to yet another news conference. We returned to the hotel at about 0100, and at 0715 Yeltsin was already speaking on the "Good Morning, America!" television program.

Maybe not everyone will find what I have written sufficiently convincing, so let me get down to hard facts and give a brief outline of our program for the 2d day of our stay in New York.

0715—Interview with ABC-TV, relayed to 84 countries in the world.

0900—Business meeting with the president of the New York Stock Exchange, where the question of U.S. financiers participating in the setting up of a similar stock exchange in the USSR was discussed.

1100—Interview with CBS-TV.

1215—Meeting and lecture at the U.S. Council on Foreign Relations.

1415—Interview with the "News Hour" [Chas Novostey] television program.

1700—A 2-hour lecture to professors, undergraduates, and postgraduate students at Columbia University.

1930—Meeting with heads of the largest U.S. charitable foundation, the Rockefeller Foundation.

2230—Departure for Baltimore.

Does this life in any way resemble "a holiday, a stage, a bar 5,000 km long"? I must admit, it will be a long time before I feel like embarking on another such "caper." Not even in America.

But let us get back to Baltimore, to the home of the president of Johns Hopkins University where, according to the article by Italian journalist Vittorio Zucconi, "Soviet populist" Boris Yeltsin got blind drunk and in the morning presented all local professors with "a slobbering drunken kiss." But what actually happened? While still on the aircraft, Yeltsin admitted that he had not slept for 2 nights running. "Unless I get in some sleep today, I'll be simply flat on my face with such a program tomorrow." He could, of course, have taken a sleeping pill, but for some time now he has done this only when absolutely necessary—sleeping pills knock him out for a whole day. This is exactly what happened on that day.

We had difficulties waking Yeltsin at 0600. We could see that the pill's effect had not worn off, especially since—as it later transpired—he had taken two of them at once. This was why his meeting with the mayor of Baltimore and leading scientists from the university, scheduled for 0700, almost failed to materialize. V. Yaroshenko had to open the meeting, but only 20 minutes later Yeltsin entered the hall and delivered a short speech. This is how events developed thereafter: A long lecture to professors and students at the university, a meeting with representatives of local charitable organizations, travel to Washington, and a meeting with the U.S. President, vice president, secretary of state, the president's national security adviser, and a large group of senators. At 1600 we took a "United" flight to Chicago, the venue for yet another 2-hour lecture delivered at the request of the local Council on Foreign Relations and attended by more than 3,000 people. That day ended at almost midnight with a news conference given by Yeltsin for representatives of national and local mass media. And all this was done after an all-night drinking session invented by some journalists!

The next morning I was brought the latest issue of THE WASHINGTON POST. I opened it and could not believe my eyes: The "Style" section, devoted to society events, carried an article about Yeltsin under the shrill headline "Drunken Bear Embraces Capitalism" [as published—THE WASHINGTON POST headline reads "Yeltsin's Boozy Bearhug for the Capitalists"]. It ironically narrated how Soviet Deputy Boris Yeltsin made his way to the bar at night, while everyone else was asleep, and drank by himself 1 ½ bottles of "Jack Daniels" Black Label whiskey, commonly known as "Black Jack." Anyone with even the slightest knowledge of newspaper affairs knows: Items like this do not appear out of the blue. What was to be done? Fortunately that morning, while we were still asleep, Yeltsin had taken a flight to Philadelphia to deliver a lecture, and we were not due to meet him until 4 hours later, already in Minneapolis. Having met to consult, all delegation members decided as follows: Nobody should tell him anything about what had happened before we returned home.

There followed a trip to Minneapolis, to Rochester where Yeltsin met Ronald Reagan, and finally to Indianapolis. Everything was going well, and we were already thinking that THE WASHINGTON POST article was nothing but a ridiculous journalistic prank. But suddenly one of the local newspapers published a similar report, but now containing fresh details: Apparently, Yeltsin started "boozing" back in New York and had been "boozing" nonstop for 4 days, and not by himself but with all the delegation members. In short, a collective binge.

Of course, our decision to conceal from Yeltsin the fact that these reports had been published was wrong. Clearly, someone was diligently fanning an ember that had been slipped in, trying to make it flare up into a blaze which could be seen from afar. Furthermore, Yeltsin could have been asked a "blunt" question at any one of the numerous news conferences, and this would have caught him unawares. Through our silence, we almost put him in an awkward situation. During the visit to a hog farm in a suburb of Indianapolis, its owner Jim Hardin invited us into his home and, without a trace or irony, remarked: "Unfortunately, I don't have any of your favorite 'Jack Daniels'!" It was only later, back in the car, that Yeltsin was to ask his aide: "Lev, I did not quite get it, which Jack was he talking about?"

Our flight from Indianapolis to Dallas was on a private jet made available to us by the head of a development and housing construction firm. Viktor Yaroshenko put before Yeltsin a translation we had made of the unfortunate article. Nobody said a word during the entire flight. It was only when he got inside the car that Yeltsin said: "All this is rubbish!"

From Dallas we made our way to Houston, to the Johnson Space Research Center. It probably astonishes specialists with its technical achievements, but I was amazed by its openness. No document checks, tours for anyone who wishes, virtually no guards to be seen. How different it all is from our own Zvezdnyy Gorodok, which does not appear on a single map, never mind the actual Flight Control Center! But this is not what I remember Houston by. It was there that we went inside a store for the first time on the trip. It was a "Randalls" supermarket. Yaroshenko and I came up with the idea of calling at this "food paradise" on the way to the airport. We had already been to America some 6 months earlier, and we recalled the powerful impression it made upon us, accustomed as we were to half-empty shelves in food stores and department stores. Thirty thousand different varieties of goods on the shelves, 40 varieties of meat, about 60 different types of sausages and cured meat—is this not worthy of admiration and envy? And if we were to talk about the "Yeltsin shock," it occurred after this 10-minute outing.

There was just one more day left, our last day. That was when another memorable event occurred. While Yeltsin was delivering his last lecture, due to finish 3 hours before takeoff, L. Sukhanov and I rushed to satisfy his "insatiable consumerist appetites." Throughout the trip, all of Yeltsin's tour money was in our hands. As a matter of fact, I could write a separate article about this and headline it "How I Spent Boris Yeltsin's Dollars." There is, of course, absolutely no need to go on about the store, which was stuffed full of goods. Nor did we have to keep on repeating "Put it on account, put it on account," since the total cost of all our purchases for B. Yeltsin personally amounted to just over $24. We chose a child's toy pistol for Boris' grandson, costing $6, and we bought two child's calculators at $9 each for his two granddaughters. We did not get any other gifts for his wife, his children, or his close or distant relatives. This $24 was the only amount spent throughout the tour on behalf of Yeltsin, who had received $900 already in New York as a per diem payment. New clothes and footwear, full boxes of white shirts, a selection of videocassettes, and two video systems—these are nothing but products of a sick imagination.

There was an amazing coincidence of two events: While people in Moscow were reading the reprint of Zucconi's article, B. Yeltsin and Jim Garrison, the main organizer of our tour, signed the following joint 4-point memorandum in full view of journalists at Miami Airport:

1. Yeltsin voluntarily renounces all fees, which ultimately amounted to a total of $100,000.

2. All fees are to be handed over to the U.S. "Esalen" Institute, which organized the American tour.

3. The total amount of fees is to be used by the U.S. side to purchase disposable syringes and ship them to the USSR.

4. Yeltsin is to organize their distribution among children's hospitals and polyclinics in Moscow.

One would have thought that this would have been the end of the matter. But this is not yet the end of our story. The 5 days spent in America following Yeltsin's departure produced a result: All U.S. newspapers published retractions of their own reports about drunkenness and insatiable consumerism on the part of the Soviet delegation headed by Yeltsin. The first to do so was THE WASHINGTON POST, whose pages provided a launchpad for the "yellow canard." The Italian journalist who became famous in our country also spoke at a news conference. He admitted that he personally had never met Yeltsin face to face. "I believed a story told by someone whom I trusted a great deal until now." Some other curious facts also came to light. For example, no accountant by the name of Alfred Ross has ever worked with the "Esalen" firm since it was founded, nor does he work there now. Generally speaking, there are mysteries aplenty in this story. For example, there has been no success in tracing Dorit Gurfel, a Russian emigre with whom Yeltsin allegedly worked at a Sverdlovsk construction site. There was no encounter with her at all, just as there was no "another raid on the stores" in a shopping mall on the outskirts of Washington.

I must narrate another curious event. A day before departing for Moscow, I received a telephone call in my room in the "Plaza" Hotel and someone who introduced himself as a staffer of a Soviet institution in America ("You can, of course, guess which one?") told me: "Comrade Voshchanov, you have a family in Moscow, just think: How are you going to return to it and will you be able to return to it at all?" I have no wish to guess the origin of this provocation. I am writing about it only to give readers an impression of the atmosphere surrounding our American "holiday," our "stage."

Jim Garrison and all of us spent 5 days looking for a firm producing disposable syringes. The hurricane which had hit several states in America made our task very hard: The U.S. Red Cross had purchased a large consignment of syringes, demand for them rose, and prices crept up. But thanks to help from the famous "United Way" charitable organization, which added some of its own money to cover the higher cost, the task was solved: A contract was concluded for the purchase of 1 million syringes.

...Readers have obviously noted that so far I have not said a single word about Yeltsin's actual speeches in America. What did he talk about? It is said that the published extracts from his speeches shocked many people, even though I personally learned virtually nothing new from them. He said everything I had repeatedly heard at crowded Moscow rallies. Should the civic stance of each and every one of us take two forms, one for domestic consumption and one for export? I don't think so.

I heard all of Yeltsin's speeches in America. I liked some of the things he said, I cannot agree with others. Yeltsin did not manage to completely convince me. But I did hear him speak, and therefore I am in a position to make up my own mind. And this is probably the main point: Maybe the time has come, at long last, to give people the right to work out for themselves what is good and what is bad, what is a pose or a game and what is a desire to make people at least a little bit happier?

The USSR Supreme Soviet has set up a commission in connection with the Soviet press coverage of B. Yeltsin's tour.

Jewish Immigrant Protests at U.S. Embassy Viewed

18001627 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 13 Sep 89 p 7

[Article by Edgar Cheporov, NOVOSTI correspondent in New York, writing for LITERATURNAYA GAZETA: "Grab for Status"]

[Text] "Shame on America!" was written on the posters. "America betrayed us! We are refugees!" hundreds of people chanted. Litters were brought to the doors of the embassy with those who had declared a hunger strike as a sign of protest.

This happened recently at the U.S. Embassy in Rome. Similar incidents began in June. Their participants and organizers were Soviet Jewish immigrants, several thousand of whom now live in the small Italian town of Ladispoli while awaiting decisions by the American immigration services. Will they be allowed into the United States as refugees, will they go there "on parole," or will they have to go to other countries, maybe even to Israel? Beginning last fall, the refugee status, previously obtainable by Jewish immigrants from the USSR automatically, became far from everything. The answer to that turn of events became the series of demonstrations at the American Embassy in Rome.

The administration did not ignore these demonstrations and organized a counterattack. The press received information in the form of a leak that the State Department, the U.S. Immigration Service, the FBI, and the CIA had worked out a plan according to which the number of Jewish immigrants obtaining the status of refugees will be significantly reduced. This in spite of the administration having to face opposition in Congress, which is disinclined to raise barriers to immigrants from the USSR.

And thus the Government of the United States is changing course. The NEW YORK TIMES stated that "for years the United States has insisted that Soviet Jews must have full freedom in the choice of destination. Now officials say the United States cannot accept everyone who wishes to come here. It cannot on grounds of economics, but also because it is more and more difficult to find confirmation that Soviet Jews are refugees on political and religious grounds." According to the government document cited by this paper, "Soviet Jews, not having relatives or other ties in the United States, will not be regarded as refugees." But almost half claiming refugee status are in this category. The same document notes that the State Department "does not wish to spend enormous sums" purchasing tickets for immigrants from the USSR.

Jewish emigration from the USSR to the United States grew, according to the American count, from 8,155 persons in 1987 to 18,965 in 1988. Prognosis for this year is 48,000. In August alone 6,756 persons received American visas—the highest level in 2 decades. For the whole year only 250 left for Israel even though emigrants leaving the USSR officially were destined there. This is why today's changes of the United States toward emigrants from the USSR have another coauthor—Israel. Only in 1987 Prime Minister Itzhak Shamir asked President R. Reagan not to offer Soviet Jews refugee status. Reagan reacted to this request reservedly. The new administration looked at it more favorably. The State Department came to the conclusion that all who did not obtain refugee status should be sent from Moscow to Israel "by the next direct charter flight." Israeli officials already expressed their approval of the increased difficulty of issuing American visas to Soviet Jews.

For many years American immigration strategy rested on purely political foundations. Jewish immigrants, the government announced, are fleeing the USSR because of repressions; they are refugees who must be saved. A significant role in the formulation of such policy was and is played by American Jewish organizations. The president of HIAS (Hebrew Immigrant Aid Service), Benzion Leuchter [name as published], stated as follows: "As I see it, any Jewish family from the USSR deserves refugee status because any Jewish family there lives in a state of constant terror. I would say that a Soviet Jew who insists that nothing threatens him is not quite right in his head."

But years have elapsed and the image of Jews emigrating from the USSR as victims of "government and social coercion" has become subject to corrosion. It was probably caused by closer acquaintance of Americans with the immigrants who have settled in their country; they did not much resemble political refugees. The New York newspaper NOVOYE RUSSKOYE SLOVO contained a reader's letter from a recent immigrant: "Leaving the Soviet Union, permeated with distrust and cynicism, we carry germs of distrust all over the world. We create legends especially for the American consulate about special persecution of Jews in the USSR, mixing up the years and facts, and we have come to believe them ourselves, justifying our exodus to ourselves." But the unwillingness of American officials to recognize some of the immigrants as refugees did not mean the refusal of entry to the United States "on parole." In that case, however, the immigrant is denied a bundle of financial aid which the refugee gets by law. A grab for these benefits became the demonstrations at the doors of the American Embassy in Rome.

RSFSR Supreme Soviet To Convene 25 October

18001694 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian Second Edition 24 Sep 89 p 1

["Ukase of the Presidium of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet on Convening the RSFSR Supreme Soviet"]

[Text] The Presidium of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] resolves:

To convene the 11th session of the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic of the 11th term on 25 October 1989 in the city of Moscow.

[Signed] Chairman of the Presidium of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet V. Vorotnikov
Secretary of the Presidium of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet S. Chistoplyasov
Moscow, 23 September 1989

The Presidium of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet communicates that the following issues are intended to be placed on the agenda for consideration by the 11th session of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet:

1. On the draft RSFSR law on amendments and additions to the RSFSR Constitution (Main Law), draft RSFSR law on the elections of RSFSR people's deputies, and draft RSFSR law on the elections of deputies to the local soviets of RSFSR people's deputies.

2. On the elections of RSFSR people's deputies and deputies of local soviets of RSFSR people's deputies.

3. On the tasks of soviet and economic organs in switching to regional economic accountability in autonomous republics, krays, oblasts, and the RSFSR.

4. On ratifying the ukases of the Presidium of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet.

Committee for RSFSR Trade Union Congress Set Up

PM2909100789 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 26 Sep 89 Second Edition p 4

[Unattributed report: "Organizing Committee Set Up"]

[Text] The Sixth All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions [AUCCTU] Plenum, held in early September this year, supported the numerous proposals by working people concerning the need to create a Russian Council of Trade Unions in the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic. At its 25 September sitting, the AUCCTU Presidium set up an organizing committee which was assigned the task of preparing and holding an All-Russian Congress of Trade Unions in the 1st quarter of next year. The organizing committee comprises workers from a series of major enterprises in the republic, trade union committee chairmen, and leaders of central and oblast committees and councils of trade unions. The committee is headed by AUCCTU Deputy Chairman I.Ye. Kolchkov.

Tajik Supreme Soviet on Soviets' Role, Elections

PM2709134389 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 25 Sep 89 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent A. Karpov report under general heading "Union Republic Supreme Soviet Sessions": "Tajik Soviet Socialist Republic"]

[Text] Deputies who assembled for an extraordinary session of the republic's Supreme Soviet, 11th Convocation, focused their attention on two draft laws—on amendments and additions to the Tajik Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Constitution and on elections of Tajik SSR people's deputies and local soviets. The session was preceded by a broad discussion of these documents, in the course of which around 1,500 proposals and remarks were submitted.

The report by USSR People's Deputy K. Makhkamov, first secretary of the Tajik Communist Party Central Committee, and the deputies' speeches emphasized that democratization of soviets' activity, expansion of their rights and powers, unconditional subordination of the executive apparatus to them, development of deputies' and all working people's activeness and initiative, and enhancement of the role of public organizations—these are today's most important practical tasks of political reform in the republic.

The main aim of the constitutional transformations which were implemented is to give the renewed representative organs of people's power not only the necessary juridical powers but also real levers of management. They affect not all the provisions of the republic's current Constitution but only those which directly concern the organization and activity of organs of state power and the reform of judicial organs.

One of the guarantees of the soviets' supremacy and the subordination of other state organs and officials to them is the incompatibility of the status of deputy with certain other offices. The new legislation limits the term for holding elected office or appointment by a soviet. Soviet chairmen (including the chairman of the Tajik SSR Supreme Soviet), soviet executive committee chairmen (including the chairman of the republic's Council of Ministers), chairmen of People's Control Committees and the Main State Board of Arbitration, and other leaders cannot be elected or appointed for more that two terms in succession (in other words, 10 years). If they fail to perform their functions properly, these persons can be relieved of office following a decision by the soviet.

By a majority of votes, the deputies rejected the holding of congresses of republican people's deputies and the practice of okrug election campaign meetings to nominate candidate deputies. Public organizations were given the right only to nominate their candidates for organs of people's power, who will then stand for election on the basis of general principles in the okrugs. The composition of the Supreme Soviet was determined—230 persons will, as a rule, work in the republic's parliament for 2-3 months.

The session adopted additions to criminal legislation and a decision to step up and improve the working people's international education.

Volodin Addresses Orel Obkom Plenum

PM2809154789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
26 Sep 89 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report under general heading: "Plenums Held"]

[Text] Orel, 25 Sep—A plenum of the Orel party oblast committee [obkom] was held today to discuss an organizational question. The plenum relieved Ye.S. Stroyev of his duties as first secretary of the CPSU obkom in connection with his election as secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

N.A. Volodin, who has worked as secretary of this CPSU obkom, was elected first secretary of the Orel party obkom.

The plenum was addressed by Ye.S. Stroyev, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

Yaroslavl People's Front Created

PM2909104389 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
26 Sep 89 Morning Edition p 2

[TASS report: People's Front in Yaroslavl"]

[Text] Yaroslavl—The constituent conference of the Yaroslavl Oblast People's Front has been held in Yaroslavl.

"The perestroyka-induced wave of public activeness has united people from the most varied strata of the population and of the most varied views and convictions," teacher Yu. Markovin, one of the movement's leaders, said. "Our aim is to help lead the country out of the crisis. We can only do this together, as a united front."

The Yaroslavl Movement for the Promotion of Perestroyka already has experience of solving concrete tasks. Thus, voters' clubs and workers clubs emerged at its initiative. They also helped in the creation of the "Charity" and "Memorial" societies and the "Green Branch" ecological movement. The front took an active part in the elections of USSR people's deputies.

"We are learning to listen to one another and respect our opponents' opinions. This indicates the growing political culture of dialogue," said G. Kalinin, head of the oblast party committee ideological department. "We are being impeded by inadequate information about matters, the extreme positions held by some of those involved in the movement, and ingrained stereotypes in methods of ideological work. I am sure that common tasks will help us to overcome such elements and to resolve together the problems which worry us all."

Anthology Chronicles Lenin's View on Nationalities

PM2909105989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
23 Sep 89 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Just Published"]

[Text] A thematic anthology entitled "V.I. Lenin on the Nationalities Issue and Nationalities Policy" has just been published. It incorporates various works, fragments of works, articles, speeches, letters, and individual statements by V.I. Lenin reflecting the history, theory, and Leninist principles and practice of resolving the nationalities issue in our country and the internationalist essence of the party's nationalities policy.

The anthology is published by the Political Literature Publishing House. The party aktiv, lecturers, propaganda workers, and students of politics and economics are its target readership.

More on Ideology Course Addressed by Officials

PM2909105389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
23 Sep 89 Second Edition p 2

[Unattributed report: "Cadre Training"]

[Text] A course for the heads of the ideology departments of the union republic communist party Central Committees, party kray committees, and party oblast committees has ended at the CPSU Central Committee Social Sciences Academy Institute for Raising the Qualifications of Leading Party, Soviet, and Ideological Cadres.

The course examined theoretical problems of the contemporary concept of socialism, the shaping of a new face for the party, the state and development prospects of the economy, the deepening of political reform in the country, the consolidation of the Soviet multinational state, the qualitative renewal of the entire system of education and instruction, the development of art and culture, the activity of the mass media in modern conditions, the safeguarding of state security, and the strengthening of socialist legality and law and order.

The discussion that developed during the course centered on the establishment of new approaches in ideological work, analysis of the contradictory processes in the development of public awareness, ways, means, and methods of resolving unusual situations, and party organizations' activity in conditions of people's growing social activeness.

The students were addressed by the following: V.A. Medvedev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; V.A. Kryuchkov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR KGB;

A.I. Lukyanov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet; L.I. Abalkin, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and academician of the USSR Academy of Sciences; A.S. Kapto, head of the CPSU Central Committee Ideology Department; A.I. Vlasov, M.F. Nenashev, L.P. Kravchenko, and N.I. Rusak, leaders of union departments; N.B. Bikkenin, chief editor of the journal KOMMUNIST; senior officials from the CPSU Central Committee and ministries, scientists, figures from the cultural and arts world, and journalists.

At extramural practical courses in the Brest, Vitebsk, Vladimir, Gorkiy, Lipetsk, Penza, Saratov, Sumy, and Tatar oblast party organizations, students were acquainted with the practice of restructuring the style and methods of party committees' political work, preparations for elections to local organs of power, and improvements in the socioeconomic situation in their region. Students met with the leaders of party and soviet organs, members of the ideological aktiv, and workers in the social sphere.

Volga Germans Set Up Society in Ukraine

PM2709145989 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 20 Sep 89 Morning Edition p6

[Own correspondent Nikolay Baklanov dispatch under the rubric "Direct Line": "Constituent Conference"]

[Text] Kiev—The Ukrainian Republic Constituent Conference of Soviet Germans has been held here, with some 80 delegates taking part.

"According to the 1979 census, 34,000 Germans live in the Ukraine," N. Ayrikh, chairman of the organizational committee, said at a press conference. "Restructuring has spurred Soviet Germans to take an active social stand and led to a sharp increase in their national self-awareness. A constituent conference was held in Moscow last March, at which the All-Union Sociopolitical and Cultural-Educational Society of Soviet Germans, 'Revival,' was formed and the society's program and statute were adopted. The main aim of the society is to restore the Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic of Volga Germans, and national regions and rural soviets in areas where there is a high concentration of Germans. The immediate tasks of the 'Revival' Society, including the society in the Ukraine, are to consolidate all patriotic forces among Soviet Germans to promote restructuring and the revival of Leninist principles in the sphere of interethnic relations; and to revive, preserve, and develop our national culture and native language."

Power Industry Faces Winter Difficulties

PM2909092989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Sep 89 Second Edition p 1

[Article by M. Glukhovskiy under the rubric "Topical Theme": "The Cold Breath of Winter"]

[Excerpt] Sverdlovsk, Moscow—[Passage omitted] How do you assess the overall situation as regards the sector's preparations for the winter? Replying to this question, D.F. Protsenko, chief of the Main Administration for Power Services [Glavenergo] and member of the collegium of the USSR Ministry of Power and Electrification mentioned that:

A fall in temperature below zero by a mere 2 degrees increases the demand for electricity by 1 percent. That means an additional daily requirement of 50 million kilowatt-hours of electricity for the national economy. In other words a major state regional electric power station [GRES] such as the Konakovskaya GRES is forced to operate at full capacity merely to cover the additional requirement. A fall in temperature by the same 2 degrees leads to a 4 percent rise in the requirement for heat—a quantity sufficient for 10 major oblasts.

Today, when the nuclear energy program has been noticeably cut back, thermal power stations have to bear the main load. Yet the volume of obsolete equipment which requires replacement is growing at these stations. Due to a shortage of capacities, dismantling of this equipment is being put off. A very difficult situation as regards energy supplies is expected in the Ukraine, North Caucasus, the Transcaucasus, Central Asia, and Kazakhstan. The total reserve within power systems will be 3-4 times lower than the normative level.

The situation has been further aggravated by the dry summer in Central Asia and Siberia. As a result hydroelectric power station reservoirs are not full.

The only solution is to make the best possible use of the existing energy potential. Repairs of power generation equipment, generally speaking, are proceeding ahead of schedule. Much attention is being paid to building up stocks of fuel. The necessary reserves of fuel oil have already been laid in. Coal stocks, on the other hand, are still more than 3 million tonnes below the target. Progress in the relaying of heat-supply networks cannot but cause concern. There is an acute shortage of pipes. [Passage omitted]

Voronin Attends Machine Builders' Day Meeting

PM2909105589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Sep 89 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Celebration"]

[Text] The participants in a ceremonial meeting devoted to Machine Builders' Day talked about improving output quality, accelerating the rate of production growth, and strengthening ties with science. The meeting was held 22 September in Moscow.

The following took part in the meeting: L.A. Voronin, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; N.P. Laverov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; G.I. Marchuk, president of the USSR

Academy of Sciences; the leaders of a number of ministries and departments, front-rank production workers, scientists, and representatives of the public.

Heavy Machine Building Minister Velichko Interviewed

LD2409193689 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 24 Sep 89

[Interview with Vladimir Makarovich Velichko, minister of heavy, power, and transport machine building, by Svetlana Parkhomenko on the occasion of Machine Builders Day; date, place of interview not given—recorded]

[Text] [Parkhomenko] Vladimir Makarovich, state acceptance of output has been introduced at most of the industry's works. It is known that this has entailed additional labor losses.

[Velichko] Unfortunately, not everyone had prepared themselves well to work in conditions of state acceptance. On the average, labor intensity for manufacture output has grown by 5-7 percent, and at individual enterprises it has grown to 15-20 percent. A system has been worked out for handing over output for state acceptance, and this work will be perfected. As a result of the measures taken it has been possible to stabilize the work of most enterprises.

[Parkhomenko] How do things stand with concluding contracts for the supply of output?

[Velichko] Enterprises have the possibility of concluding direct contracts with a client independently for the remaining amount. It's our opinion that the amount of state orders throughout the industry as a whole should not exceed 60-70 percent of the overall amount and that it may vacillate with individual specialized enterprises. For this the state order should not include the complete stocklist of output but only machinery and equipment which is of very great significance for the national economy, primarily efficient machinery.

[Parkhomenko] Are there any loss-making, unprofitable enterprises in your industry?

[Velichkov] Yes, unfortunately we still have some of those. There are six enterprises which are still under construction and whose production capacities are being assimilated. They will operate for the time being on subsidies from the ministry's centralized funds, the scale of which is to be reduced over the years. Our industry does not reconcile itself to still having loss-making enterprises. In the current 5-Year Plan the level of the losses is to be reduced by a factor of 4 or 5. We have no alternative.

[Parkhomenko] That's interesting. What are your relations like with partner enterprises during the transition to the new conditions of economic management? This is certainly of considerable importance.

[Velichko] In many respects the successful operation of the industry's enterprises depends on partner enterprises, of course. There isn't a single piece of machinery supplied by our enterprises whose manufacture has not involved the use of outside materials and components. Any supply failure on the part of partner enterprises places a heavy burden on the main supplier.

[Parkhomenko] And how can this problem be solved?

[Velichko] First and foremost, direct and longstanding ties must be extended between main enterprises and partner enterprises; we should go over to wholesale trading in a wide range of materials and items and raise the degree of responsibility of manufacturers.

Dushanbe Special Food Store Closed

PM2509092989 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 23 Sep 89 Morning Edition p 3

[Dispatch by Aleksandr Karpov: "Special Store Closed"]

[Text] Dushanbe—The Dushanbe City Soviet Executive Committee [Gorispolkom] has decided to close the special food store which used to serve leading workers of republican and city rank. Given the more than modest range of goods in the city's ordinary food stores, this store could not but make people angry.

"A food store will be situated here which will supply children's and medical treatment institutions with food," Kh. Salimov, chief of the Dushanbe Gorispolkom trade administration, said. "As for the special store's customers, like most of Dushanbe's inhabitants they will be registered at the order desks in ordinary food stores."

Official Interviewed on Crime Rate Data

LD2609102389

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1856 GMT on 25 September carries an 11-minute "Ministry of the Interior News Roundup" program in which correspondent V. Bakarinov interviews S. G. Lisauskas, deputy USSR minister of internal affairs, about the crime rate in the Soviet Union.

Stasis Genrikovich Lisauskas tells the correspondent in an office setting that information coming into the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs lists many grave crimes. The correspondent suggests that democratization and glasnost have removed the taboo on crime statistics and that perhaps the public have been frightened by the figures which have emerged.

Lisauskas says: "I want to stress one point. Today we do not have the highest level of crime in our country. We have referred to 1985. Why 1985? Because that year had the highest level of crime in the country. Well then, in the first half of 1985, 3.6 percent more serious crimes were committed in the country than in the first half of this year."

Lisauskas says that this does not provide any grounds for joy or for thinking that the crime situation is favorable. The questions which are being asked are just. However, when people write newspaper articles, there is often a juggling of bare facts instead of analysis of the reasons for the crimes. Lisauskas would like the population to receive deeper information, more considered reports which investigate the reasons for crime.

Lisauskas says: "Using the prism of the events of the week, I would like to draw attention to the following point: Today prevention of crime is the main issue in the activity of the internal affairs, and not only of the internal affairs bodies. We are speaking today about a state program for prevention of violations of the law." This issue was raised at the first Congress of People's Deputies and at the Supreme Soviet, and indeed such a state plan for preventing crime is needed, says Lisauskas.

Lisauskas continues: "But such a program, like any other, requires plenty of resources, both financial and other resources. I would like to speak about nonmonetary prevention. There are crimes which no state program will help solve." He goes on to list cases where cashiers at wine shops and elsewhere are careless about locking up money, thereby making themselves easy targets for thieves. Thousands of such thefts take place each year, and the people responsible for looking after money at enterprises are often just as responsible—due to carelessness—for a crime as the thief, says Lisauskas, citing two such incidents from the past week, one in Kazakhstan and one in Moscow.

Bakarinov asks how the decisions of last week's nationalities plenum of the CPSU Central Committee will affect the work of the Ministry of Internal Affairs.

Lisauskas says that the plenum's documents bear a major political and practical signiifcance. "The workers of the Internal Affairs Ministry, jointly with the other law-and-order bodies, must undertake the most strict measures to stop actions directed at the incitement of interethnic strife and of other similar phenomena." Lisauskas says that it has long been clear that there is no alternative to restructuring and democracy. "Democracy requires stability, order, organization, and most strict observance of the law. At the same time, we will be compelled to react to lawlessness and violence with force, force that is based on the law, force which protects democracy. Unfortunately—and I continue that thought—I want to say that last week was tragic for the internal affairs bodies: Two of our staff died on Azerbaijani soil at the hands of extremists," says Lisauskas. He goes on: "The ciminals have been detained and will be brought to court. Availing of the opportunities offered by television, I once more wish, on behalf of the Collegium of the USSR Internal Affairs Ministry, to express deep condolences to the near and dear of those who perished."

Bakarinov says that the number of crimes committed by young people seems to be growing every week. Why is this so?

Lisauskas says that the academic and school year has now resumed and young people have gone back to study. The internal affairs people had not been ready for the problems which could arise among the young when there were no classes to occupy them.

Lisauskas continues: :I just want to mention that last week was typical, there being several incidents which bordered on mass disorders. Here is a specific example. On 21 September at approximately midnight, a mass fight took place in Semipalatinsk between the adolescents and youth of two mikrorayons. The consequences are most severe. One person died at the scene. Two died later in hospital. And there are also injured parties." Lisauskas says there were other similar incidents, mostly caused by heavy drinking.

Lisauskas recalls that the collegium of the USSR Internal Affairs Ministry noted the problem of juvenile crime as a priority area for prevention at the start of 1989. Unfortunately, not all local internal affairs officials have paid due attention to the instructions from the Collegium. The Ministry will soon review this issue once more in a serious manner, with all the ensuing consequences.

Bakarinov raises the issue of fires which cause immense damage to the country. Lisauskas says that this is a fair point. Lisauskas says: "According to the data which we possess, something like 2,700 fires break out in the country every week and the damage incurred amounts to approximately R7.5 million." Nine major fires around the country last week caused damage of R3.5 million. Violations of fire safety procedures were a factor in most cases. The Central Committee recently instructed the internal affairs bodies to do something about these fires, and gave many powers. Lisauskas says that today's PRAVDA notes that discipline must be augmented. Lisauskas promises that the Internal Affairs Ministry will act according to the requirement of the present day.

Economic

Ministers Criticized for Consumer Shortages

PM2809130789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
24 Sep 89 Second Edition p 3

[TASS report: "At the USSR Council of Ministers"]

[Text] The USSR Council of Ministers Presidium has heard reports from a number of USSR ministers on measures which they are taking to fulfill set targets for the production and marketing of goods in mass demand.

The session noted that the program drawn up by the government to increase consumer goods production will make it possible to substantially improve supplies to the population in the very near future. In the current year the increase in the supply of goods is to total almost R35 billion, that is, it will double in comparison with last year. In addition, funds have been found and additional purchases of import goods are being made to a total of around R10 billion.

However, the situation on the consumer market in respect of many types of goods remains strained. The main reason for this is that individual USSR ministries and departments and union republic Councils of Ministers are not tackling specific questions connected with increasing the production of goods needed by the population resolutely enough, and are not making full use of the rights and opportunities which they have been granted. As a result the shortfall in the supply of goods to trade outlets during the January-August period totaled R8.4 billion, including large quantities of washing machines, electric vacuum cleaners, refrigerators, bicycles, wall paper, chemical batteries, and many simple goods in mass demand.

Sharp criticism was leveled at N.A. Pugin, USSR minister of Automotive and Agricultural Machine Building, and O.G. Anfimov, USSR minister of the Electrical Equipment and Instrument Making Industry [name of ministry as published], whose enterprises have built up the biggest lag in the fulfillment of consumer goods production plans. Virtually all union republics with the exception of the Ukraine and Lithuania have failed to meet their targets for increased production of these goods.

It was noted at the session that union republic Councils of Ministers are still not paying sufficient attention to the problem of improving food supplies. This is borne out by the fact that during the past 8 months the shortfall in the supply of v`pava, Tula, Rostov, Kiev, and Gorkiy Oblasts, thousands of cars have accumulated there.

According to N.S. Konarev, USSR minister of railways, as of 21 September some 1,000 freightcars containing food and consumer goods had not been unloaded in Leningrad. Almost as many freightcars with the same types goods have amassed in Moscow. More than 20,000 containers, mainly with industrial consumer goods and canned products, are also standing around at freight and container depots in these places. A considerable number of freightcars stand around for more than a week before they are unloaded. The Moscow City Soviet, the Leningrad City Soviet, and the USSR Ministry of Trade have failed to take appropriate steps. In all, owing to the inefficiency of local organs, food and nonfood goods to the value of more than R1 billion are waiting at railroad stations to be shipped out. Proposals were voiced at the session about handing over consumer goods, and especially foodstuffs, to other regions in the event of long delays in the unloading of freightcars containing these goods.

The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium declared intolerable the attitude of leaders of USSR ministries and departments and union republic Councils of Ministers toward ensuring consumer goods deliveries to the market, and instructed them to adopt all the measures necessary to ensure the unconditional fulfillment of the targets set for 1989. Special attention was focused on the need to eliminate the lag in deliveries of essential goods, and above all foodstuffs, soap, detergents, clothing, and footwear.

Note was taken of statements by USSR Minister Comrades Pugin and Anfimov to the effect that the 9-month plans and the plans for 1989 as a whole for the delivery of the full range of consumer goods would be fulfilled by the USSR Ministry of Automotive and Agricultural Machine Building and the USSR Ministry of the Electrical Equipment and Instrument Making Industry.

The USSR State Committee for Material and Technical Supply [Gossnab] has been instructed to examine without delay all questions connected with the implementation of the program for the production of consumer goods for the 4th quarter of the current year and to ensure that solutions to them are found.

It was emphasized that a breakthrough in the improvement of supplies to the poppulation of goods in mass demand will be achieved only as a result of a radical increase in the activeness and responsibility of ministries and departments, union republic Councils of Ministers, and local soviet and economic organs.

Newsmen Given Declassified Data on Foreign Trade

PM2909090989 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 26 Sep 89 Second Edition p 3

[Unattributed report: "Declassifying 'Secrets'"]

[Text] Statements about the inefficiency of our foreign economic ties have been made repeatedly in the last few months in some speeches by USSR people's deputies and the mass media. The latest briefing in the USSR Ministry of Foreign Economic Relations was devoted to this topic.

This presentation of the issue is largely due to ignorance, T. Teodorovich, chief of the Foreign Economic Policy Main Consolidated Administration, said. After all, figures on the efficiency of foreign trade have unfortunately never before been openly published in the press. Now a lot of data is being declassified.

According to the release supplied by the Ministry of Foreign Economic Relations, the net contribution of foreign economic ties to the country's national income amounted to almost R50 billion last year. In other words, as it was said at the briefing, every R1 invested in foreign economic ties produced revenue of R2.15 for the USSR national economy.

A comparison shows, Comrade Teodorovich added, that efficiency did really decline somewhat in the last few years due to a deterioration in the correlation between world prices for Soviet export and import commodities. For example, the same indicators in 1985 stood at R63.8 billion and R2.95 respectively. The declassified secrets offered to journalists are full of figures and percentages. They certainly call for comment, and we will ask specialists to do so in the very near future.

Scientific

Civilian Production Begins at Space Facility

18230077 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 22 Sep 89 p 2

[Report on interview with Anatoliy Ivanovich Kiselev, Director of the M.V. Khrunichev Machine Building Plant, by G. Lomanov: "Bicycles for Children and Orbiting Modules"; date not given; for further inormation on this plant, see KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA article on p 89 of 26 September DAILY REPORT]

[Text] Bicycles for children and orbiting modules are produced by the same plant. This is symbolic. However, is this symbol in line with the tasks of conversion in aerospace production?

"We are now standing on the runway," said Director of the imeni M.V. Khrunichev Machine Building Plant Anatoliy Ivanovich Kiselev.

Actually, we assembled in a small, cozy conference hall. However, a long time ago there indeed used to be an airfield at the present location of the building for the assembly of space vehicles. For many years, this plant sort of did not exist. There was a "post office box" number, and that was it. This was a secret enterprise. This summer, its secret status was revoked; specialists from China and Japan had already visited here. Finally, they invited Soviet journalists as well. Well, it is better late.... At any rate, the desire of the plant director, who has been working at the plant for 34 years, since age 17, to tell us about the history of the enterprise is quite justified.

So, here is some history. In 1918, they repaired here, in Fili, the armored cars and tanks which were sent to the vicinity of Tula to meet the White Guard troops. One of the first five Soviet passenger cars rolled out of the plant gates 2 years later. It was presented to the "all-union elder" M.I. Kalinin. Later, Junkers received in the form of a concession the enterprise which produced 100 Ju-20 planes. Beginning in 1927, the plant embarked on producing heavy aircraft: Before the war, they made Tupolev's TB-1's and TB-3's; during the war, the PE-2 dive bomber, and the TU-2 and IL-4 bombers. In the 1950's, strategic bombers designed by Myasishchev were produced which are still in service. One of those craft was adapted for carrying the Buran (our newspaper has reported on this operation).

Work on the Proton rocket designed by V.N. Chelomey is yet another milestone in the history of the plant. For almost a quarter of a century, since 1965, the Protons have been putting into orbit heavy satellites and orbiting stations, and have been launching interplanetary vehicles to the Moon, Mars, and Venus. There have been 180 launches; the old workhorse knows his job. This is a reliable machine, and our space exploration owes many brilliant successes to it. All permanent orbiting stations beginning with the first Salyut and through the Mir which is now in orbit have been built at the imeni M.V. Khrunichev Plant. The collective is also proud of the Kosmos-1443 apparatus—at the time when everything was classified whether it was necessary or not it was called "a satellite," despite it actually being an excellent spaceship which the cosmonauts who were looking forward to flying it also told me with enthusiasm. Alas, it did not come out. This is one more "blank spot" in our space exploration, but this is a separate topic. For now, let me observe that by docking with Salyut 7 Kosmos-1443 demonstrated an opportunity for large masses to dock successfully in orbit. The creation of research modules for the Mir station could hardly have been initiated without this "reconnaissance in force."

Anatoliy Ivanovich says: "Now there is a new turn in the history of the plant. The production of Protons has been cut back approximately one-third. The conversion of aerospace production is beginning."

[Lomanov] What are you going to do?

[Kiselev] Even now we produce a wide range of consumer goods. Many people certainly know the bicycles for children Druzhok; it is just that they did not know before that we were the producer. Meanwhile, this is a plant within a plant; we produce 220,000 of them a year. We make ski poles, pressure cookers, kitchen furniture, garden sheds, sleighs, hoops for gymnastics, what have you. The share of consumer goods and civilian output in the total volume of our production is approximately 25 percent.

[Lomanov] You know, Anatoliy Ivanovich, I do not admire this enumeration. Moreover, it brings up the biting retort by the economist A. Kireyev: "Of course, the enterprises which have created Buran and Energiya are capable of riveting together metal beds in which we can sleep as soon as the coming night. However, when we wake up tomorrow, we will find out that, to our amazement, not only the developed world but also many of the countries which are traditionally called developing have, as far as technology, gone into the third millennium before the appointed time while we have been left behind in the old squeaky bed."

[Kiselev] We are likewise reluctant to engage in primitive production and waste the high technical potential of the plant for trifles, says A. Kiselev. This is why we have now planned two main avenues for ourselves, health care and ecology. A quarter of a century ago, high-quality ozonizers were invented in our country. They do a marvelous job cleaning up organic compounds in waste waters; they are patented in several countries, but thus far nobody has been producing them. We have embarked on this. We will produce the Superterm installation for the treatment of oncological diseases by local heating. Together with the Moscow Association of the Handicapped, we are setting up the PRINKO cooperative. We have already embarked on manufacturing a trial batch of knee joints for artificial limbs. Taking the experience of Chernobyl into account, we will produce robots capable of working in the course of accident clean-up.

[Lomanov] What will you go into while cutting back the productions of the Protons?

[Kiselev] We are planning to manufacture equipment for converting passenger cars to gas on the premises freed up.

We stood together with Chief Engineer of the plant Yu. Gorodnichev in front of a huge vacuum chamber, 5 meters in diameter. Sealing is the forte of the enterprise. Yuriy Petrovich told us how carefully space vehicles are checked out before being shipped to the space complex. Quite recently, one of the modules for the Mir was tested. Incidentally, there were several modules at different stages of completion sitting in the shop—they immediately caught your eye.

Yuriy Petrovich observed: "Three of them are ready, and two have been tested." Naturally, the conversation immediately switched to another topic and another emotional tonality. The plant personnel were even taken aback by the question on the reasons why the launch of research modules was being delayed then.

"What do you mean it is delayed?" asked back A. Kiselev. "We sent the additional equipment module to the space complex right on schedule, to the day, as long ago as July of last year."

[Lomanov] Why has it been sitting idle so long?

"The plant has got nothing to do with this," Deputy Minister of General Machine Building, Chief of the USSR Glavkosmos [Main Space Administration] A.I. Dunayev came to the rescue. "The enterprise was given the deadline and assigned the task, and the collective handled it excellently. The delay is due to other reasons. First, the contractor enterprises which were making the 'filling' for the modules had very many orders for the Buran program. Preparations for launching the space 'shuttle' caused a major diversion of both scientific and production resources. Second, it turned out after the docking of the new modification of the Progress cargo ship that even a comparatively small change in the configuration of the orbiting complex makes controlling it much more difficult. This is to say nothing about the module; after it is docked, the space combination will resemble a high boot. Dynamic operations will be rendered extremely difficult. You see, we have to fully equip the second module and get it docked on the opposite side in order to balance the assembly. After all, the 'high boot' may fly for about 3 months and no longer. This means that modules have to be launched almost one after the other. This is why we delayed the first one deliberately."

...Well, research and technical modules manufactured at the imeni M.V. Khrunichev Machine Building Plant will soon reach the Mir. However, space exploration is not the only customer of the enterprise anymore. We would like to believe that, while developing the manufacturing of products which are not associated with space, the collective will go toward its future on something more modern rather than the Druzhok bicycle.

The director is right: We cannot waste the experience which has been accumulated in one of the most progressive industries.

Parameters of 'Intercosmos-24' Satellite Given

LD2809120189 Moscow TASS in English 1152 GMT 28 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow September 28 TASS—The Soviet Union today launched another satellite in the Intercosmos series, in keeping with the socialist countries' programme of cooperation in the exploration and use of outer space for peaceful purposes.

Intercosmos-24 was launched by a Cyclone rocket as part of the international Aktivny (Active) research project for the comprehensive study of low-frequency electromagnetic waves in the magnetosphere and their interaction with charged radiation belts particles.

A sizeable share of the research will be done by actively irradiating near-satellite plasma with low-frequency electromagnetic emissions.

Intercosmos-24 carries a Czechoslovak satellite called Magion-2. The satellites' scientific and telemetry equipment has been developed and made in countries grouped in the Intercosmos programme—Bulgaria, Hungary, the German Democratic Republic, Poland, Romania, the USSR and Czechoslovakia.

The scientific part of the programme will begin after Magion-2 separates from Intercosmos-24 in the next seven to nine days.

Intercosmos-24 was placed in an orbit with the following parameters:

Maximum distance from earth - 2,497 kilometers,

Minimum distance - 511 kilometers,

Initial period of revolution - 116 minutes,

Inclination - 82.6 degrees.

Foreign scientists and specialists, who had developed on-board equipment, took part in testing the satellites and preparing them for launch at the spaceport.

The Intercosmos-24 satellite's on-board systems are functioning normally.

Ground stations of the command-and-control network in the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia's telemetry receiving station are processing incoming information.

Joint Cancer Expedition Yields Results

OW2809134989 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1900 GMT 27 Sep 89

[Correspondent Leonid Savitskiy video report from the "120 minutes" program]

[Text] A group of scientists from the Pacific Ocean Institute of Bio-organic Chemistry of the Far Eastern Branch of the USSR Academy of Sciences has returned to Vladivostok after an expedition. Here is what our correspondent Leonid Savitskiy reports. [Video shows the research ship "Akademik Oparin" steaming into Vladivostok Port, shots of a technician working in a laboratory, and various views of the ship and other vessels in port]

[Savitskiy] The "Akademik Oparin" is one of the few ships in the world built especially to study marine organisms with the aim of extracting medicinal compounds from them. The sponges, soft corals, and mollusca brought up from the ocean floor by divers were not only studied here in the biotechnology and biosynthesis laboratories but what was particularly valuable was that the substances extracted from them were tested on the spot. For this purpose 5,000 laboratory animals were carried on board the ship during the cruise.

This voyage was an international one as scientists and specialists from Australia and the United States worked together with the Soviet biologists. [Video cuts to show V.A. Rasskazov, head of the expedition, speaking to an off-screen reporter on the deck of the ship]

[Begin Rasskazov recording] We really had close contacts in the framework of a joint project: The fight against cancer. A program of this kind exists between the Academy of Sciences of the United States and our Academy of Sciences. A fairly large number of different organisms containing potentially useful substances for research into antitumor and anticancer compounds was discovered. Very interesting compounds possessing antiviral properties were found. Besides, during this cruise we also began research aimed at finding substances that could be used for treating AIDS. [end recording]

Military

Kuzmin Cited on Baltic Military District Issues

PM2809151589 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 23 Sep 89 First Edition p 2

[Composite interview with Colonel General F. Kuzmin, commander of the Baltic Military District, by special correspondent Captain Third Rank A. Orlov under the rubric "Deputy's Platform": "Col Gen F. Kuzmin: Facing Up"; first paragraph is correspondent's introduction]

[Excerpts] I met with USSR People's Deputy Col Gen F. Kuzmin, commander of the Baltic Military District, for the first time a week ago in Riga. The second meeting took place later, in Moscow, when the CPSU Central Committee Plenum had concluded its work on the party's nationalities policy in present conditions. The interview is composed from these two meetings.

[Orlov] Fedor Mikhaylovich, you were at the CPSU Central Committee plenum and participated in its work. To what extent were the problems in the Baltic republics reflected in its decisions?

[Kuzmin] I think they were fully reflected. Everyone is by now already familiar with the general secretary's report and the speeches of the plenum's participants. I know for sure that people in Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia are constantly following the press and the television. And I believe I am not just speaking for myself here: The interesting report gives people with various different views a great deal of food for thought. As a person who heard it directly, all I want is for this to be transmitted to the majority. The party is sincerely striving for renewal and improvement in interethnic relations. And it needs our wholehearted support in this.

[Orlov] Did the plenum meet up to your expectations?

[Kuzmin] Here I suddenly understood just how tired the Soviet people are of the discord that is being kindled. The whole country and each republic have so many economic and social problems, but our basic forces are diverted to something completely different. The plenum's decisions must become a great moral support to all healthy forces. This includes the Baltic.

[Orlov] There is probably no need to say that general attention is focused on the Baltic. In perestroyka, side by side with the positive things, there is a great deal that is difficult to agree with. The recent CPSU Central Committee Statement was imbued with anxiety.

[Kuzmin] Yes, it is now maybe more important than at any other time to give an impartial and appropriate evaluation of everything that is taking place in the republics. The more so since some people would like to present the above-mentioned statement as "an attempted infringement on the rights of the peoples." In the opinion of the majority of my voters, not just mine: The statement was timely and did not in any way aim to infringe the people's rights. On the contrary, other hotheads must be cooled down so that all this does not turn out to be a fatal mistake for the inhabitants of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

[Orlov] As I understand it, the troops in the district live a normal life. But does this also refer to the political stance and morale of the military collectives?

[Kuzmin] No, of course not. We live the same life as the inhabitants of the Baltic republics. The turbulent politicalization of society is taking place. This affects us as well. Soldiers too are now thinking in serious terms, and are maturing rapidly. As regards the officers, they are not just living among the same abundance of political information as all the people, but they are also themselves experiencing all the discomforting conditions. For example, a certain officer came to see me recently. He had arrived from a group of forces. He was a family man. He had nowhere to live and and no registration. But there are in the district 10,134 people without an apartment. There is a USSR Council of Ministers resolution on registration for military unit accommodation, but the units have no accommodation. And if you have no registration you cannot go to the stores. There is no such thing as a "visitor's card"—a document you need in order to obtain provisions. We recently requested about 10,000 "visitor's cards," but straightaway extreme bewilderment was expressed in one of the Riga newspapers on this subject. How can a child be put into a nursery school without registration? Or an officer's wife go to work, because in their economic situation an "extra" wage will not do any harm?

[Orlov] In addition, it is not beyond the realm of possibility to hear yourself called an "occupier." Or worse, to read this, for example, in KAUNO ALDAS, the press organ of "Sajudis," Lithuania's perestroyka movement: "The presence today of the occupation army in Lithuania is restricting the people's possibility of free self-determination"...

[Kuzmin] Such attacks on the army, just like the slogans on secession from the USSR, do not represent the stance of the whole local population, including the indigenous population. We constantly note that the overwhelming majority of Balts are serving very well. And this speaks for itself. That means that there is in their families an appropriate attitude to the Soviet Army, internationalism, and patriotic duty. And in the national character of a Lithuanian, a Latvian, and an Estonian there is a deeply rooted respectful attitude toward the servicemen. Whatever they say about the years 1939-40, the ordinary people understood then and understand now: The Red Army acted as a protector of the Baltic lands against a very dangerous neighbor, who unleashed war in 1941. But the people who feel the need to ignore this are even becoming involved in actions that are hard to take seriously. This concerned me personally when, at the end of August, an enormous sign appeared on one of the fences around the drama theatre saying: "Kuzmin Is a Red Occupier!"

[Orlov] It seems to me that this is no laughing matter. Unfortunately at the moment we do not have—and there is not even any mention of one—a law guaranteeing the protection of a serviceman's honor and dignity. If there was such a law, veterans involved in the liberation of the Baltic states would not fail to protect themselves from injustice. But no doubt some countermeasures are being undertaken?

[Kuzmin] We have at our disposal a great quantity of documents which are the best way of dealing with this. These documents are appearing in the district newspaper ZA RODINU and in the central press. Near the district headquarters, to counter, so to speak, the pickets' displays, a photo display called "The Truth About 1939-1940" has been mounted. And the veterans themselves are helping us a great deal by speaking to the young people and the working people. I remember the words of one old soldier who said one day at a meeting with voters: "Occupiers are not greeted with a gun salute, as we were in 1939. Invaders do not pay for provisions and rented accommodation, as we did. Today too it is obvious to any sensible person that it was no conqueror risking his life to save people and property in the fire at the State Electrical Equipment Plant. Or in eliminating the emergency situation at the nitrogen combine in Lithuania." Incidentally, immediately after the accident "Sajudis" complained to a newspaper about the army, saying that it took it a long time eliminate the consequences. But the soldiers and officers dealt with everything within a day. As they say, if facts contradict your words, so much the worse for the facts....

[Orlov] But all the same, Fedor Mikhaylovich, don't the district servicemen sometimes bring reproaches upon themselves?

[Kuzmin] It was simply inevitable that we would talk about this. So that there is no false interpretation: The troops of the district are not excluded from fair criticism. We ourselves aim to publicly examine the causes of any incident or negative phenomenon. We do not intend to hush up every incident of hazing or unworthy behavior in the city. There is now high exactingness toward commanders and political officials who are lenient toward violations of discipline. We can protect ourselves from criticism only by increasing self-discipline and not by words, which are voiced from platforms in sufficient quantities. But we must not perceive every critical article in a local or central newspaper as discrediting the army. Even if our shortcomings are seen through a magnifying glass. Servicemen, especially the officer corps, have no right to give the slightest reason for reproach.

[Orlov] The editorial office receives a great deal of mail regarding interethnic relations in the army. I recall one of the latest, where the author, a Kiev worker, writes that in the army, nationalities are becoming increasingly separate and soldiers of different nationalities are becoming increasingly guarded in relations with each other. Isn't there some truth in this?

[Kuzmin] The Armed Forces are perhaps the social institution with the greatest concentration of different nationalities. I repeat once again that we are not fenced off from real life. However, a healthy army collective is capable of resisting any dissension like no other collective. And all the same.... The soldiers are fed the most diverse information. Here we have local ethnic newspapers and the bulletins of people's fronts and international fronts. Even pamphlets. There are instances such as these. Every word is interpreted in a different way in people's minds. How do you think a young man will respond to a reproach to his people? Or to the army in which he is serving? If there is a picket at the gates of your unit displaying slogans such as "We Are Fed Up With the Occupiers!" it is difficult to say how a Lithuanian soldier will look at a Russian, Ukrainian, or Kazakh fellow soldier. But we in the district are satisfied with interethnic relations in the units.

[Orlov] All the healthy forces of the Baltic republics are faced with the increasingly distinct task of consolidating the overall effort. Do the leaders of the so-called radical organizations seek dialogue with you, as a people's deputy?

[Kuzmin] Meetings have been held with many leaders of people's and international fronts. As a deputy, I mix with other deputies, among whom there are quite a few activists from various informal groups. Quite recently, Lieutenant General Zinchenko, chief of the district's political directorate, and I talked to representatives of the Latvian Women's League. Meetings are being held....

[Orlov] But who takes the initiative for such meetings most often?

[Kuzmin] The initiative for individual meetings sometimes comes from the "informals." But it is hard to say that there is a particular initiative here. We are open to discussion. But perhaps there could be more initiative on our part. We must actively find a common language.

[Orlov] One day, the radio station "Svoboda" told an anecdote which has apparently been widely circulated in the USSR. It essentially concerns a Baltic Military District officer who got involved in an argument between representatives of the People's Front and Interfront about the possibility of victory in the elections, asserted that it was impossible for both fronts to win, and said he believed that the Baltic Military District would win....

[Kuzmin] Well, some people find it useful to drive a wedge firmly between the army and the people. Frightening people by talking of troops, special provisions, and military coups is a bad method to adopt.... I think that in the last few years, after the events in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast, in Georgia, Abkhazia, and Novyy Uzen, we have all become wiser and have learned to value peace and civilized relations between people. In any case, the army has learned this lesson. The more some people want to make a situation heated, the calmer we have to be. Many people have tried to upset the army's balance: On the one hand, by attacks on it, and on the other by asking provocative questions—"How long will you put up with this?" What can we say? We have quite a lot of patience. [Passage omitted]

[Orlov] What have you recently been involved in as a deputy?

[Kuzmin] I am not on any permanent commission. With other USSR people's deputies I have participated in drafting USSR Ministry of Defense proposals on sensitive questions regarding officer service. I have taken part in formulating proposals to improve the lives of war and labor veterans, invalids, and poorly paid sections of the population. I have taken part in resolving issues connected with improving the working conditions of women and mothers. I am becoming more and more convinced that fruitful solutions to the problems that have accumulated in society and in the army can only be achieved jointly. I realized this again at the plenum. [Passage omitted]

[Orlov] Our conversation was interrupted several times both in Riga and in Moscow. Some service and other issues needed a decision. At such moments, the thought came to mind that a great deal depends on this man's stance. And the right to this stance is acquired by living and reflecting on what is happening. And by bearing the responsibility for decisions and for the trust of thousands of people....

General Shabanov Notes Projected Arms Cuts

LD2809152889 Moscow TASS in English 1444 GMT 28 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow September 28 TASS—Projected cuts in Soviet arms and armed forces will save the country some 30 billion rubles, Army General Anatoliy Shabanov [name as received], deputy defence minister for armaments, told TASS today.

In an interview dealing with the conversion of defence industries and military hardware to meet civilian purposes, he predicted that if the process continues under favourable international conditions, the share of defence spending in the national income will decrease by an even greater margin by 1995.

Currently, civilian products account for 40 per cent of the output of defence factories.

"Thanks to continued diversification, that is partial conversion, the share is to top 46 per cent in 1990 and 60 per cent in 1995. This is going to do a lot towards balancing the domestic market," General Shabanov said.

Work is underway to completely convert three defence factories, which will make it possible to try out different conversion methods, he disclosed.

Apart from financial and material resources released as a result of the reduction of the armed forces and defence spending, the national economy will also receive substantial amounts of equipment.

"This will probably involve the handing over in 1989 and 1990 of over 45,000 lorries and chasis, crawler prime movers, transporters, engineering equipment, radio and telephone facilities, refuelling systems and fuel tank trucks," the general said.

He added that some categories of aircraft and ancillary naval ships will also be put to civilian use.

This year alone, Shabanov said, the army will transfer motor vehicles, equipment, materials and other property worth up to 500 million rubles in wholesale prices to the state supply agency. The armed forces will also make available nearly ten million rubles worth of fuel and lubricants.

The supply agency's regional branches have already begun to receive all this at army and naval warehouses and pass the supplies on to various civilian organisations and cooperatives.

Batkov Says Soviet 'Stealth' Not Planned

LD2609181389 Moscow TASS in English 1720 GMT 26 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow September 26 TASS—By TASS correspondent Yuriy Kozmin:

Although the characteristics of the "Stealth" fighter-plane remain secret, the plane, that is in blueprints, already described as the "miracle-plane of the 21st century".

The U.S. Congress is now discussing the appropriation of billions of dollars for building plane and for the manufacture of the B-2 "Stealth" bomber.

Commenting on these facts, Aleksandr Batkov, a leading Soviet specialist in aircraft equipment, chief of the main developments board of the USSR Ministry of Aircraft Industry, told TASS:

"Soviet scientists engaged in research in this direction arrived at the conclusion that the creation of a "stealth" plane will require considerable outlays and is therefore inexpedient.

"The country's defences can be maintained at the due level through the modernisation of the anti-aircraft defence system with smaller outlays.

"The USSR already has an aircraft for long-range radar spotting of aerial targets, patterned on the U.S. AWACS system, and if the United States produces a 'Stealth' fighter-plane and B-2 bomber plane, Soviet anti-aircraft defence forces will be equipped with radar stations that will be detecting such aircraft."

Batkov said new equipment designed by Soviet specialists can be used not only to detect military aircraft but also for civilian purposes: In the navigation systems of airliners, which would considerably enhance the safety of air traffic, in the equipment to monitor movements of vessels in fog in the harbors of large ports, and cable television to improve the quality of images.